EXHIBIT "2"

CONDENSED TRANSCRIPT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

VIKING YACHT COMPANY, a New Jersey Corporation and POST MARINE CO., INC., a New Jersey Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

vs. NO. 05-CV-538 (JEI/JS)

CURRAN COMPOSITES, INC.,
a Missouri Corporation,
C TWO LLC, a foreign
Limited Liability Company,
and TOTAL COMPOSITES, INC.,
a Delaware Corporation
jointly d/b/a COOK
COMPOSITES AND POLYMERS,
a fictitiously named
Delaware Partnership,

Defendants.

Videotaped deposition of
DAVID E. JONES, III, taken at the law
offices of BUCHANAN INGERSOLL &
ROONEY, P.C., 1835 Market Street,
14th Floor, Philadelphia, PA, on
Wednesday, January 30, 2008,
commencing at approximately 9:09 a.m.
before Joanne Rose, a Registered
Professional Reporter, Certified
Realtime Reporter and Notary Public,
pursuant to notice.



James DeCrescenzo Reporting, LLC

215.564.3905 I N N O V PHONE 1880 JFK Blvd.

INNOVATING LITIGATION
1880 JFK Blvd., 6th Floor • Philadelphia, PA 19103
www.jdreporting.com

215.751.0581 FAX 2 (Pages 2 to 5)

2	4
	·
APPEARANCES: DED GED SINGEDMAN	1 EXHIBIT INDEX (CONTINUED) 2 MARKED
BERGER SINGERMAN MICHEL O. WEISZ, ESQUIRE	3 Janes
mweisz@bergersingerman.com	10 Four-page document 129 4 containing e-mail dated
200 South Biscayne Boulevard Suite 1000	3/23/05 to F. Moser, et
Miami, Florida 33131-5308	5 al. from Y. Colon and attached documents, Nos.
305-755-9500	6 VK132781-VK132784
and HENRY J. TYLER. ESQUIRE	7 11 Two-page document 131
htylerinw@comcast net	containing note from the 8 Desk of Juan Beltran with
Society Hill Office Park	attached e-mail, Nos.
1874 Route 70 East, Suite 4 Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08003	9 VK132685 and VK132687 10 12 Two-page document 133
856-751-2282	containing e-mail dated 11 12/4/02 to Al Uhl, et al.
Appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY, P C	11 12/4/02 to Al Uhl, et al. from J. Beltran with
STEVEN E. BIZAR, ESQUIRE	12 attached note, Nos.
steven.bizar@bipc.com	VK132670 and VK132669
MEREDITH MYERS LeCONEY, ESQUIRE meredith.leconey@bipc com	13 Three-page document 135
1835 Market Street	14 containing e-mail dated 12/9/02 to D. Passarelli
14th Floor	15 from J. Beltran with
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 215-665-8700	nttached handwritten 16 notes, Nos. VK1326668
Appearing on behalf of Defendants	-66 and -67
ALSO PRESENT:	17 14 U.S. District Court 140
	18 Subpoena
Jack Lynch, Videographer	19 15 Multi-page document 153 indicating results of
EXAMINATION INDEX	20 exposure testing, Nos.
DAVID E JONES	DÉJ00648-DEJ00710
BY MR. BIZAR 7	16 Multi-page document 157
	22 containing Technical Requests, e-mails and
	23 analytical reports, Nos.
	DEJ00712-DEJ000773
	L ⁴⁴
MARKED Jones 1 Curriculum Vitae of David 12 E. Jones, III 2 Five-page letter/report 61 to M. Weizs from D. Jones	2 MARKED 3 Jones 17 One-page e-mail series, 172 4 the first of which is
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 47//04 4 Five-page Viking document 104 with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal 116 Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 C Two-page document 119 containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/20/05 to J Kasinski from B. Heller	dated 9/10/04 to J Kasinski, et al. from I. Rutt, No VK004124 18 Five-page document 177 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and thermogram graphs, Nos VK004116-VK004120 19 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Cracking in Viking Bost #55-945 and attached 13 letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internai Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/26/05 to J Kasinski from B. Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and 9 thermogram graphs, Nos. VK004116-VK004120 10 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 11 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Cracking in Viking Bost #55-945 and attached 13 letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 196
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/20/05 to J Kasinski from B. Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from I. Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and thermogram graphs, Nos VK004116-VK004120 10 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 11 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of 12 Cracking in Viking Boat #55-945 and attached 13 letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 196 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internai Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/26/05 to J Kasinski from B Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953 7 Two-page document from Juan Beltran dated	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and 9 thermogram graphs, Nos. VK004116-VK004120 10 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 11 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of 12 Cracking in Viking Boat #55-945 and attached 13 letter, "Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 19 20 Three-page letter dated 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman from R. Mannella, Nos. VK001622-VK001624
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/20/05 to J Kasinski from B. Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953 7 Two-page document from Juan Beltran dated 1/19/2000, Nos.	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and thermogram graphs, Nos VK004116-VK004120 10 19 Multi-page CCP report entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Cracking in Viking Boat #55-945 and attached 13 letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DE197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman from R. Mannella, Nos 16 VK001622-VK001624 17 21 Four-page document 202
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/20/05 to J Rasinski from B. Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953 7 Two-page document from Juan Beltran dated 1/19/2000, Nos. VK132461-VK132462	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and thermogram graphs, Nos VK004116-VK004120 10 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 11 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Cracking in Viking Boat #55-945 and attached 13 letter, Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman from R. Marnella, Nos. 16 VK001622-VK001624 17 21 Four-page document 202 containing DJ&A invoices
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/20/05 to I Kasinski from B Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953 7 Two-page document from Juan Beltran dated 1/19/2000, Nos. VK132461-VK132462 8 One-page e-mail dated 6/19/03 to S Blair from	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and thermogram graphs, Nos VK004116-VK004120 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Cracking in Viking Boat #55-945 and attached 13 letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 196 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman from R. Mannella, Nos VK001622-VK001624 17 21 Four-page document 202 containing DJ&A invoices Nos. DEJ-002-000002-DEJ-002-000005
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document 119 containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/20/05 to J Kasinski from B. Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953 7 Two-page document from Juan Beltran dated 1/19/2000, Nos. VK132461-VK132462 8 One-page e-mail dated 124 6/19/03 to S Blair from J. Beltran, No. VK1324448	dated 9/10/04 to J S Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and thermogram graphs, Nos VK004116-VK004120 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 11 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Crecking in Viking Boat #55-945 and attached 13 letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman from R. Mannella, Nos VK001622-VK001624 17 21 Four-page document 202 containing DJ&A invoices Nos. DEJ-002-000002-DEJ-002-000005
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/20/05 to I Kasinski from B Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953 7 Two-page document from Juan Beltran dated 1/19/2000, Nos. VK132461-VK132462 8 One-page e-mail dated 6/19/03 to S Blair from	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and thermogram graphs, Nos VK004116-VK004120 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Cracking in Viking Boat #55-945 and attached 13 letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 14 20 Three-page letter dated 196 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman from R. Mannella, Nos VK001622-VK001624 17 21 Four-page document 202 containing DJ&A invoices Nos. DEJ-002-000002-DEJ-002-000005
3 Two-page letter/e-mail to D Jones from S Murphy dated 4/7/04 4 Five-page Viking document with boat dimensions Nos. VK003599-VK003603 5 Three-page CCP Internal Report document dated 9/17/03, Nos. CCP06822-CCP06824 6 Two-page document containing e-mail series the first of which is dated 5/26/05 to J Kasinski from B Heller Nos VK003952-VK003953 7 Two-page document from Juan Behran dated 1/19/2000, Nos. VK132461-VK132462 8 One-page e-mail dated 6/19/03 to S Blair from J. Behran, No. VK132448 9 One-page e-mail to Drew 127	dated 9/10/04 to J 5 Kasinski, et al. from L Rutt, No VK004124 6 18 Five-page document 177 7 containing fax transmittal dated 9/20/04 8 to Mr Jones with attached e-mail and 9 thermogram graphs, Nos. VK004116-VK004120 10 19 Multi-page CCP report 187 11 entitled "Determination of the Root Cause of Cracking in Viking Bost #55-945 and attached letter," Nos. DEJ 00191-DEJ197 42 20 Three-page letter dated 196 15 4/23/04 to D Sweetman from R. Mannella, Nos. VK001622-VK001624 17 21 Four-page document 202 containing DJ&A invoices 18 Nos. DEJ-002-000002-DEJ-002-000005

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're

б

2 now on the video record.

This is the videotape

4 deposition of David Evan Jones taken

by the defense in the matter of

6 Viking Yacht Company and Post Marine

7 Co., Incorporated v. Curran

8 Composites, Incorporated, C Two LLC,

9 Total Composites, Incorporated,

10 jointly Cook Composites And Polymers,

11 in the United States District Court

12 for the District of New Jersey,

13 Number 05-CV-538.

14 Held at the offices of

15 Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney, PC, 1835

16 Market Street, 14th Floor,

17 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on

18 Wednesday, January 30, 2008, at

19 9:09 a.m.

20 I'm Jack Lynch, the

21 videographer. The court reporter is

22 Joanne Rose. We are from the firm of

23 James DeCrescenzo Reporting in

24 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

8

l marine engineer. My specialty is

2 structural composites.

3 Q. When you say your specialty

4 is structural composites, what do you

5 mean by that?

6 A. Essentially it's all the

7 ingredients, the fibers, resins,

8 cores that go into the building of a

9 composite yacht or a fiberglass yacht

10 or a marine craft of some sort.

11 Q And with regard to those 12 ingredients that you just identified,

13 what do you do as a specialist in

14 structural composites relative to

15 those ingredients?

16 A. I owned a test laboratory

17 for 11 years and we tested strictly

18 composites. The failure modes and

19 the strengths and weaknesses of the

20 composites.

21 I've designed composite

22 structures for a variety of yachts.

23 I've done a lot of failure analysis

4 of why boats break and how to repair

7

Will counsel please

2 introduce themselves.

3 MR. WEISZ: Michel Weisz

and Henry Tyler on behalf of the

5 plaintiffs.

1

7

9

14

6 MR BIZAR: Steve Bizar and

Meredith LeConey on behalf of the

8 defendant.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The

10 reporter will swear in the witness.

DAVID E. JONES, III, having

12 been duly sworn, was examined and

13 testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. BIZAR:

16 O. Mr. Jones, good morning.

17 A. Good morning.

18 Q. Would you please state your

19 full name for the record?

20 A. My name is David Evan Jones

21 and I'm a third.

22 Q What is your occupation,

23 sir?

24

A. I'm a naval architect and a

9

1 them.

2 Q. Take me briefly through

3 your educational background, if you

4 would

5 A. I have a Bachelor's of

6 engineering, mechanical engineering,

7 from Steven's Institute of Technology

8 in Hoboken, New Jersey, and with a

9 specialization in small craft design.

10 Q. Do you have any additional

11 degrees beyond that?

12 A. No, sir.

13 Q. Do you have any special

14 training beyond the Bachelor's degree

15 of mechanical engineering?

16 A. No formal education other

17 than that.

18 O. You're not a chemist?

19 A. No. sir.

Q. You're not a chemical

21 engineer?

20

22 A. No, sir.

23 Q. You're not a lawyer?

24 A. No. sir.

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

10

- O. People always laugh when I
- 2 ask that question. I can never quite 3
- grasp why. 4 You have no special
- 5 training in warranty law?
- 6 A. No. sir.
- Q. Do you see warranties in
- 8 your practice?
- 9 A. Quite often.
- 10 Q. Do you see warranties for
- 11 materials?
- 12 A. Occasionally, yes.
- 13 Q. Do you see warranties for
- gel coats? 14
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Do you see warranties by
- boat builders for their boats? 17
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Are you aware of any boat
- 20 builders who warrant gel coat
- 21 cracking?
- 22 A. No, sir, I'm not.
- 23 Q. Are you aware of any gel
- 24 coat manufacturers who warrant gel

12

- nature, yes.
- 2 Let's just mark that and
- 3 we'll be sure that we're on the same
- 4 page. That will save us some time.
- 5 A. Yeah.

- 6 MR. BIZAR: This will be
 - Jones Exhibit 1.
- 8 (Exhibit Jones 1 was marked
- 9 for identification.)
- 10 BY MR BIZAR:
- 11 Q. Mr. Jones, the court
- reporter has handed you a copy of the 12
- CV that I just mentioned and we've 13
- had that marked as Jones Exhibit 1.
- 15 Take a moment, look through it. Just
- 16 confirm for me, if you would, that
- 17 that's accurate as of August 2007.
- 18 A Yes, sir
- 19 Q. Have there been any
- 20 developments in your professional
- work since August 2007 that you need 21
- 22 to report to me to make this
- 23 up-to-date and current?
- 24 In other words, have you

- coat cracking as opposed to that the
- gel coat would meet its
- 3 specifications as manufactured?
- 4 A. No. sir.
- 5 Q. No, sir, you're not aware
- 6 of any?
- 7 A. I'm not aware of any.
- Q. Now, tell me you've
- identified some of the things that
- 10 you've done. Just - well, let me do
- 11 it this way.
- 12 You've provided us together
- with the report that you issued in 13
- this case, which we'll be discussing
- 15 shortly, a curriculum vitae, a CV,
- that listed your work history and
- 17 some other things.
- 18 Do you recall that?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. Was that accurate as of the
- 21 date it was provided to us, which was
- 2.2 August 24, 2007?
- 23 A. As far as my work history
- and publications and things of that

- 13
- taken on any additional positions or jobs beyond those that are identified
- 3
- in this document, Exhibit 1?
- 4 A. No. The only thing that 5 may not be up-to-date is the trial
- and deposition cases. 6
- 7 Q. Have you testified in any
- 8 cases beyond those listed on the
- 9 second-to-last page of Exhibit 1?
- 10 A Yes, sir.
- 11 O. Tell me the names of those
- 12 cases.
- A. Matthew Trainer vs. 13
- Charleston Harbor Marina; Gary Wyatt 14
- vs. Luhrs; Frank Feltham vs. Luhrs. 15
- O. Can you spell Mr. Feltham's 16
- 17 name?
- 18 A. Capital F-e-l-t-h-a-m.
- 19 Q. And Luhrs is?
- 20 A. L-u-h-r-s.
- 21 Q. Okay. Any other cases
- 22 beyond those three?
- 23 A. Well, I was engaged in
- 24 another one which was Austin Spencely



5 (Pages 14 to 17)

14

vs. Luhrs but before my deposition

that one was settled. 2

O. You did work and issued a 3

4 report in that case?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I take it from this list of

cases you've been through this

8 process before.

5

6

7

So just let me tell you, if

10 you have a question or you don't

understand one of my questions, let

me know. I'll reformulate the

question. I want to make sure you

14 understand the question.

15 If you answer a question

without telling me, I'm going to

17 assume that you understood the

question and that the answer you gave

was in response to my question. Is 19

20 that fair?

21 A. That's fair.

22 Q. Okay. Tell me what the

23 business of D.E. Jones & Associates

24

16

began - withdrawn.

2 Since 1990, 1991 an aspect

3 of your work has included working

4 with lawyers in contested matters -5

A. Yes, sir.

Q. - involving marine issues?

A. Yes, sir, composite issues.

8 Q. Okay. And how many such

matters have you worked on since

10 1990, 1991?

A. That's hard to say, maybe

12 20 or so.

6

7

9

11

20

2

13 Q. Would it be more than 30?

14 A. I don't think so.

15 Q. If there are ten listed on

your CV and an additional three that 16

have occurred since your CV was 17

18 provided to us, plus this one, that

19 takes us to 14.

Do you think there are an

21 additional six or ten out there

22 beyond these?

A. There's probably another 23

six. I don't think there would be 24

15

A. D.E. Jones & Associates has 1

been a consulting company since 1987. 2

3 We have performed services,

4 everything from designing new

5 facilities for production boat

builders, establishing quality 6

7 control procedures for builders,

originating original designs for 8

9 various builders, quality

10 inspections, forensic analysis, a lot

of why did my boat break and how do I

12 fix it kind of things.

Q. And is that the business 13

through which you do your work as an 14

expert witness for litigated,

16 contested matters in court?

17 A. Yes, sir.

Q. And have you been involved 18

in that field since 1987? 19

A. Working with lawyers in 20

21 litigation and things of that nature

22 probably didn't happen until about

23 '90, '91.

24 Q. But since 1990, 1991 you 17

1 another ten.

Q. Okay. And Revenge Advanced

Composites, which is listed as

something that you're also involved

5 in, tell me what the business of that

6 company is.

7 A. Revenge Advanced Composites

is a builder of high-end sport

fishing boats and special purpose 9

craft. We use - we use techniques 10

from the aerospace industry to 11

12 construct the product.

Q. Where is Revenge Advanced 13

Composites based? 14

A. They're in Clearwater, 15

16 Florida.

Q. Are you an owner of that 17

18 business?

19 A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you're an owner of D.E.

20 21 Jones & Associates?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Do you have any partners?

24 A. In D.E. Jones?



6 (Pages 18 to 21)

1 Q Yes.

5

7

- 2 A. No, sir.
- 3 Q. Do you have any partners in

18

- 4 Revenge Advanced Composites?
 - A Yes, I do
- 6 Q. How many?
 - A. Oh, I have three major
- 8 partners and maybe a dozen what we
- 9 call class B partners.
- 10 Q. Are any of your major
- 11 partners affiliated in any way with
- 12 Viking Yacht Company?
- 13 A. No, sir.
- 14 Q. Are any of your major
- 15 partners affiliated with Post Marine
- 16 Company?
- 17 A. No, sir.
- 18 Q. Are any of your class B
- 19 partners affiliated with either of
- 20 those two companies?
- 21 A. No, sir.
- 22 Q. With regard to your
- 23 testifying experience, let's talk
- 24 about that

20

- 1 O. And who hired you in that
- 2 matter, the plaintiff or the
- 3 defendant?

4

7

9

11

- A. That was Trump Towers.
- 5 Q. And they were the
- 6 plaintiff?
 - A Trump Taj Mahal, they were
- 8 the plaintiff.
 - Q. They were the party that
- 10 experienced the failure?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. And what was your opinion
- 13 as to the cause of the failure in
- 14 that matter?
- 15 A. That was the the dyes on
- 16 the metal flake were inferior and
- 17 experienced color shifts, dramatic
- 18 color shifts. There were also some
- 19 manufacturing issues where on some
- 20 parts they had applied a clear coat
- 21 and some parts they had not.
- 22 Q. Manufacturing issues with
- 23 regard to the dyes or manufacturing
 - issues I'm sorry. Withdrawn.

19

- 1 Your work on the Trump Taj
- 2 Mahal Associates vs. Dumont matter,
- 3 what were you asked to do in that
- 4 case?
- 5 A. That was a failure of the
- 6 coatings and what I did there was
- 7 analyze what the issues were, how
- 8 widespread it was and what the cause
- 9 of the problem was.
- 10 Q. What were the coatings in
- 11 question?
- 12 A. They were mostly metal
- 13 flake gel coats and clear coats.
- 14 Q. Who manufactured them?
- 15 A. I don't think I recall.
- 16 Q. On what were they applied?
- 17 A. They were applied onto what
- 18 I affectionately call gingerbread.
- 19 It's architectural cladding that goes
- 20 on the side of a building to
- 21 represent a theme.
- Q. And they're exposed to the
- 23 elements on the side of the building?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.

- 1 Manufacturing issues with
- 2 regard to the coatings themselves or
- 3 with regard to the application of the
- 4 coatings to whatever they were
- 5 applied to?
- 6 A. It was just the
- 7 application, whether they put the
- 8 clear coat on or not.
- 9 Q. Okay. So part of your
- 10 opinion cast blame on the coating
- 11 manufacturer and part on the builder
- 12 of the piece?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. And were you -- did you
- 15 testify in a deposition in that
- 16 matter?
- 17 A. Yes, I did.
- 18 Q. And did you testify at
- 19 trial?
- 20 A. No, sir.
- 21 Q. Do you know what the
- 22 resolution of the matter was?
- 23 A. There was a settlement
- 24 offer.



7 (Pages 22 to 25)

2

5

22

- 1 O. In the Underwriters at
- 2 Lloyds London matter vs. Michael T.
- 3 and Eric V. Gray, what was the
- 4 subject of your work in that case?
- 5 A. Louisiana. Let's see.
- 6 Hang on Oh, I remember that one.
- 7 That was a keel that fell off a
- 8 sailboat.
- 9 Q. So your opinion did not
- 10 have anything to do with coatings in
- 1 that matter?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. And did you testify in that
- 14 case?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. By deposition?
- 17 A. By deposition and in court.
- 18 Q. Were you found qualified as
- 19 an expert in that case?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Have you ever not been
- 22 found to be qualified as an expert?
- 23 A. No, sir.
- 24 Q. Each time that you've been

24

- 1 Construction case?
 - A. No. sir.
- 3 Q. Deposition?
- 4 A. Yes.
 - O. In the Backwin, Global
- 6 Insurance and Albany Insurance
- 7 Company of New York vs. Delta Marine,
- 8 who hired you, the plaintiff or the
- 9 defendant?
- 10 A. That was Delta Marine.
- 11 That would be the defendant.
- 12 Q. And what was the subject of
- 13 your work in that case?
- 14 A. There was a claim of faulty
- 15 construction.
- 16 Q. Of what?
- 17 A. Of the hull and the rudder
- 18 configuration.
- 19 Q. And your claim was that the
- 20 construction your opinion was that
- 21 the construction was not faulty?
 - A. Correct.
- 23 Q. And what was the resolution
- 24 of that case?

22

2

23

- 1 offered, you've been accepted as an
- 2 expert?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 O. In the Black & Gold
- 5 Construction Company case what
- 6 opinion did you offer?
- 7 A. There was a construction
- 8 error and a faulty repair in that
- 9 boat.
- 10 Q. Who engaged you in the
- 11 Black & Gold Construction case, the
- 12 plaintiff or the defendant?
- 13 A. The plaintiff.
- 14 Q. And going back to the
- 15 Underwriters case, who hired you
- 16 there?
- 17 A. That would have been the -
- 18 Q. The plaintiff again?
- 19 A. I think that was
- 20 Underwriters.
- 21 Q. Which was the plaintiff?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. And did you testify at
- 24 trial in the Black & Gold

25

- 1 A. Delta prevailed.
 - Q. You testified at trial?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. By deposition?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. Did the case settle or did
- 7 it not go to trial?
- 8 A. I'm not sure I know.
- 9 Q Chase-Freedman Family Trust
- 10 vs. Broward Marine, what was the
- 11 subject of your work in that case?
- 12 A. That one, it was a claim
- 13 that the boat was unstable and this
- 14 was after nine years of use. The
- 15 owner of the boat decided that the
- 16 boat was a little tippy and he sued
- 17 Broward and I represented Broward.
- 18 Q. And your conclusion in that
- 19 case was that the boat was not tippy
- 20 as a result of any manufacturing
- 21 problem?

- A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. Did you testify at trial?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.



8 (Pages 26 to 29)

26

- 1 Q. And in deposition?
- 2 A Yes, sir.
- 3 O. And what was the result in
- 4 that case?
- 5 A. Broward prevailed.
- 6 Q. Who did you -- who hired
- you in the Northern Island Nautical
- 8 Associates, Limited case?
- A Doug Nash.
- 10 Q. The plaintiff, in other
- 11 words?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. And what was the subject of
- 14 your work in that case?
- 15 A. That was mainly
- 16 hydrodynamics and stability of the
- 17 vessel.
- 18 O. And what was your opinion?
- 19 A. That the boat really was
- 20 okay.
- 21 Q. And did you testify in
- 22 court in that case?
- 23 A. No, sir.
- 24 Q. Deposition?

28

- 1 deposition?
 - A. Deposition and trial.
- 3 Q. And what was the resolution
- 4 there?

2

7

9

- 5 A. I think there was a little
- 6 give-and-take on that one.
 - Q. It was resolved, settled?
- 8 A. Yes.
 - O. Mariah Boats, Inc. vs.
- 10 Owens-Corning, who hired you in that
- 11 matter?
- 12 A. That was Mariah, the
- 13 defendant.
- 14 Q. Mariah is the plaintiff.
- 15 A. Or plaintiff.
- 16 Q. Yes. What was the subject
- 17 of your work?
- 18 A. That was that was a case
- 19 where boats were blistering before
- 20 they even got out of the factory and
- 21 it was due to a change in resin made
- 22 by the resin supplier.
- 23 And as we found out, it was
- 24 a bad formulation of resin that

27

- 1 A. Yes, I believe I did.
 - Q. What was the result; do you
- Q.3 know?
- 4 A. It was settled so I really
- 5 don't know the result.
- 6 Q. That's fine. The next case
- 7 listed on your list is John F.
- 8 Inganamort & Pleasurecraft, Inc. vs.
- 9 Insurance Company of North America.
- 10 Who hired you in that
- 11 matter?
- 12 A. That was John Inganamort.
- 13 Q. So the plaintiff?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 O. And what was the subject of
- 16 your work in that matter?
- 17 A. That was a boat that was
- 18 dropped in the travel lift. The
- 19 travel lift transmission failed and
- 20 dropped the boat and we were I was
- 21 there talking about extent of damage
- 22 and what it would take to repair the
- 23 boat.
- 24 Q. Did you testify at

29

- 1 continued on for three years.
 - Q. And did you testify in
- 3 court in that matter?
- 4 A. No. That one never got to
- 5 court.

2

- 6 Q. You testified in
- 7 deposition?
- 8 A. Yes, I believe I did.
 - O. The case was settled?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. And when you say resin, you
- 12 don't mean gel coat? You mean a
- 13 different back-up or a laminating
- 14 resin?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. Just so we're on the same
- 17 page, if you're referring to gel
- 18 coat, I'd appreciate it if you'd
- 19 refer to gel coat. And if you're
- 20 referring to some other type of
- 21 resin, just use the term resin
- 22 A. I will.
- 23 Q. It makes it easier for us.
- 24 MR. WEISZ: I'm just going

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

to object to that, but we can discuss

2 that later. I just want to note an

3 objection on the record as to the

4 form

7

Q

5 MR. BIZAR: Okay.

6 BY MR BIZAR:

Q. The Weinstein matter, who

8 did you work for in that matter?

A. The plaintiffs.

10 Q. And what was the subject of

11 your work?

12 A. That was a series of, I

13 believe, five boats that all had the

14 same structural issues and I

15 testified on these structural issues.

16 Q. Did you testify at

17 deposition and in trial?

18 A. Both.

19 Q. What was the result in that

20 case?

21 A. The court awarded repair

22 costs.

23 Q. The Domenech matter, who

24 did you work for in that matter?

32

1 Q. So your client did not

2 prevail?

3

7

11

A. Correct.

4 Q. In the Matthew Trainer vs.

5 Charleston Harbor Marina case that

6 you mentioned —

A. Yes, sir.

8 Q - what was your - who

9 hired you in that matter?

A. Charleston Harbor.

Q. And what was the subject of

12 your work?

13 A. There was a claim of bad

14 fuel caused the boat to sink.

15 Q. And I take it your opinion

16 put the blame on some other factor?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. Where was the case pending?

19 A. Charleston Harbor or

20 Charleston, South Carolina.

21 Q. Okay. In federal or state

22 court?

23 A. I believe that was federal

24 court.

31

1 A. I believe that was

2 Domenech.

3 Q. And what was the subject of

4 your work in that matter?

5 A. That was a case where the

6 owner claimed faulty construction,

7 blisters, poor blister repair and

8 things of that nature.

9 Q. And your opinion was

10 supporting those claims?

11 A. Well, actually, no. No, it

12 didn't. The repair was adequate, but

13 the blisters were just an artifact of

14 the construction.

15 Q. And what was the result in

16 that matter? Well, first of all, did

17 you testify in court?

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. And in deposition as well?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. And what was the result in

22 that case?

23 A. I don't believe the

24 plaintiff got any relief.

33

Q. What was the year? I guess

it was - I'm sorry. It's not listed

3 here.

1

2

7

4 A. It would have been just

5 last year.

6 Q. End of 2007?

A. Yeah. Mid 2007 maybe.

8 Q. And the Gary Wyatt matter,

9 did you testify for the plaintiff or

10 the defendant?

11 A. That one is ongoing. And I

12 worked with Gary Wyatt.

13 Q. In all of these matters

14 involving Luhrs, is it fair to say

15 that you're working for the plaintiff

16 against Luhrs?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. Have you testified yet in

19 the Gary Wyatt matter?

A. No. sir.

21 Q. What court is that pending

22 in?

20

A. I'm not really sure I know.

24 Q. Okay. And the Feltham

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

7

13

34

matter, what court is that pending

2 in?

4

- 3 A. That was also Charleston.
 - Q. Do you know if it's federal

5 or state?

6 A. That I think is federal and

7 they settled.

- Q. Did you give testimony in 8
- that matter, the Feltham matter? 9 10 A. I wrote a report and I
- believe I had a deposition on that 11

12

- Q. Are there any other 13
- 14 litigated cases that you can remember
- by name in which you've been

16 involved?

- 17 A. Not off the top of my head,
- 18 no, sir.
- 19 Q. Is the only case in which
- 20 you've been involved and given
- 21 testimony that directly involves gel
- 22 coat or coatings of a gel coat sort,
- 23 the Trump Taj Mahal case?
- 24 A. Yes. The Mariah case vs.

36

- you've issued in this case, which
- we'll be talking about, I take it
- that your opinion does not address in
- any way, shape or form blistering,
- 5 porosity, chalking or color matching? 6
 - A. Correct.
 - O. So those issues, to the
- extent they exist or are phenomena of
- gel coat or gel coat and some
- combination of substrates, are not 10
 - subjects that you'll be offering
- 1.2 testimony about at trial?
 - A. Correct.
- 14 Q. Now, you have provided a
- 15 written report in this case?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. And you understand that you
- have an obligation in that report to 18
- 19 make a full and complete disclosure
- 20 of the materials that you consulted
- 21 and relied upon in your work; is that
- 22 right?
- 23 A. That's correct...
- 24 Q. And you've done that in

35

- AOC was also a gel coat blistering
- phenomenon, but it was related to the
- 3 substrate and not the gel coat.
- 4 Q You're familiar with the 5 concept of blistering, obviously?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And you're also familiar, I
- 8 presume, with the concept of
- 9 porosity?

7

- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. And you're familiar with
- the concept of chalking? 12
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. And you're familiar with
- 15 the problem of color matching?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. All of these issues relate
- to gel coats, among other coatings?
- A. Gel coat formulations, yes. 19
- 20 Q. Okay.

24

- A. With the exception of 21
- blistering. Blistering may or may
- not be a gel coat phenomenon. .23
 - Q. With regard to the opinion

37

1 your report?

2

15

- A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. In other words, the
- 4 materials listed in your report are
- 5 the materials that you consulted and
- 6 relied on in forming your opinions?
- 7 A. Yes, sir.
- 8 Q. And other than maybe your
- 9 own experience and learning from
- 10 working in the field in which you
- work, there are no other materials 11
- that directly bear on this case that 12
- 13 you considered in forming your
- 14 opinions; is that right?
 - A. That is also right.
- Q. And your written report 16
- 17 contains the opinions that you would
- 18 testify to if accepted at trial; is
- 19 that right?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. There are no other opinions
- 22 not in that report that you would
- 23 offer?
- 24 A. No, sir.

James DeCrescenzo Reporting, LLC

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

38

- Q. Have you worked previously
- prior to this case with Mr. Weisz?
- 3 A. No.
- O. Have you worked previously,
- meaning prior to this case, with Mr. 5
- 6 Tyler?

8

11

- A. No, sir. 7
 - Q. Did you do anything to
- prepare for your deposition
- 10 testimony?
 - A. I read my report again.
- 12 Q. Other than that? Did you
- do anything to prepare for your
- 14 deposition testimony?
- 15 A. No, sir.
- O. You didn't review any 16
- 17 documents?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. You didn't speak to
- anybody? 20
- 21 A. I had dinner with Mr. Weisz
- 22 last night.
- 23 Q. I hope he picked up the
- 24 tab.

40

- in my records. Sigma has been I
- 2 sold the business, I believe, in '99
- 3 and I'd really have to go back to my
- records to find out exactly what we
- 5 did. Most likely it was laminate
- 6 testing.
- 7 Q. So this was a situation
- 8 where Viking would have hired you or
- this company, Sigma Laboratories, to
- 10 do testing on some laminates that
- 11 they were considering using or using?
- 12 A. You're correct.
- 13 Q. And is that something that
- 14 your business at that time, Sigma
- Laboratories, did a fair amount of? 15
- 16 A. Yes, sir. We did quite a
- 17 bit

1

2

- 18 Q. And was that the first
- 19 engagement that Viking had with you? 20
 - A. Well, I've known the
- 21 Healeys from about 1983. They
- actually bought the company that I
- was working for at the time in 1987 23
- or late 1986. 24

- A. Yes. 1
- O. Have you worked previously 2
- with Viking Yacht Company prior to
- your engagement as an expert in this
- 5 case?
- A. Yes, I believe I have. 6
 - O. Tell me about that work.
- What have you done previously in any
- 9 prior assignments with Viking Yacht
- 10 Company?
- A. I believe it was mostly 11
- with Sigma Laboratories. Sigma was a
- division of D.E. Jones & Associates
- and I believe we did some testing for 14
- 15 them.
- 16 Just through being in the
- 17 industry for the last 20-some-odd
- years, I've known the Healeys through
- business associates. 19
- 20 O. Let's break those down.
- 21 What work did you do
- 22 through Sigma Laboratories for Viking
- 23 Yacht Company?
- 24 A. I'd really have to go back

- Q. What company was that?
- A. That was Gulfstar Yachts.
- 3 Q. And did you continue
- working for Gulfstar Yachts after 4
 - they purchased it?
- 5 A. The deal actually went 6
- 7 through in the fall of '87 and I
- 8 departed Gulfstar in March of '87.
- 9 Q. So you had a brief overlap
- 10 before the deal closed?
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. In which you were working
- 13 for the Healeys?
- 14 A. Not actually working. They
- took over in the fall of '87. 15
- Q. I see. 16
- A. So I never actually worked 17
- 18 for them.
- 19 Q. Okay. But since that time
- 20 you've known them?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. And how has that - how has
- 23 knowing them manifested itself? Have
- you seen them socially?



12 (Pages 42 to 45)

42

- A. No. No. I don't believe 1
- 2 I've ever had a social engagement
- 3 with them.
- 4 Q. Have you seen them
- 5 professionally?
- 6 A. Yes. It would be at boat
- 7 shows and things of that nature.
- 8 Q. And the Healeys are the
- 9 owners of Viking; is that right?
- 10 A. Correct. And particularly
- I'm talking about Bob and Bill. 11
- Q. Not Pat? 1.2
- 13 A. I know Pat, but I just
- 14 recently met him.
- 15 Q. Did you meet him in
- 16 connection with this case?
- A. Yes, sir. 17
- Q. When did you meet Pat in 18
- connection with this case? 19
- 20 A. It would have been when I
- 21 first went to see the Tortora boat,
- which was a Viking 55. And I guess
- 23 this was early....
- 24 Q. 2004, 2005?

44

- well?
- 2 A. Oh, certainly.
- 3 Q. Do manufacturers also have
- 4 the ability to test the way that gel
- 5 coat or coatings interact with their
- laminates or their laminate 7
 - structures?
- 8 In other words, if the
- 9 manufacturer wanted to test a
- 10 particular gel coat with its
- laminate, would that be something 11
- that could be done? 12
- 13 A. There's a couple of ways of
- 14 testing gel coat, yes, sir.
- 15 Q. And is that something that
- 16 has been available to manufacturers,
- 17 boat manufacturers, since the late
- 1990s? 18
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 O. Was it available to boat
- 21 manufacturers in 1997?
- 22 A. Oh, sure.
- 23 Q. What are those ways of
- 24 testing gel coats and laminates

43

- A. Yeah, probably '5 I think. 1
- Q. So that was before you were 2
- hired to be an expert on behalf of
- Viking in this lawsuit; is that 4
- 5 right?
- A. That's correct. 6
- 7 O Do you recall why it was
- that Viking was testing a laminate
- through your laboratory, Sigma 9
- 10 Laboratories?
- A. No, I wouldn't recall. 11
- Q. Do boat manufacturers often 12
- test the materials that they'll be 13
- using or that they are using in their 14
- 15 composites?
- 16 A. Very often.
- Q. And why do they do that? 17
- 18 A. Well, they do it to verify
- 19 the mechanical properties for their
- engineering, a prediction of early
- 21 failures, whether it meets the
- 22 strength and stiffness requirements,
- 23 things of that nature.
- 24 Q. Do they test flexibility as

- together? 1 2 A. Well, the typical ways that
- 3 builders will take a look at gel
- coats is the weatherability and this

45

- 5 would be QUV testing, exposure
- 6 testing.
- 7 There would also be what we
- 8 used to call the boil test, but we
- don't actually use boiling water 9
- 10 anymore. It's about 150 degrees or
- 11 so. And that's mainly for blister
- 12 resistance.

13

- There are some thin-film
- permeability tests that can be 14
- performed. But usually when they -15
- and there would be first cracking of 16
- the gel coat and that would normally 17
- 18 be performed in a flex test.
- 19 Q. And all of those tests were
- available to boat manufacturers in 20
- 21 the late 1990s?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. From 1997 on?
- 24 A. Earlier.



3

7

11

46

- Q. Earlier than 1997? 1
- 2 A. Yes, sir.

5

7

- 3 Q. And how much do they cost
- 4 to do these tests?
 - A. A set of tests back then, I
- don't know what they cost now. 6
 - Q. But back then, when you
- 8 were in the business?
- 9 A. Back then it would be
- 10 roughly \$30 a sample. And you do a
- minimum of five and most often you do
- six or seven and that would give you
- one number. 13
- 14 Q. So these tests could be
- done for several thousands of 15
- dollars? 16
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And in your experience, as 18
- a laboratory owner in this field, did
- boat manufacturers engage your lab to
- 21 do these tests on a routine basis?
- A. Yes, sir. 22
- 23 Q. And are there other labs,
- 24 aside from Sigma Labs -

48

- have you done any work for Viking
- Yacht Company? 2
 - A. No. sir.

A. No. sir.

- Q. And what about Post Marine?
- Have you done work for Post Marine 5
- 6 prior to this?
- 8 Q. Does this case represent
- 9 your first encounter with Post Marine
- 10 professionally?
 - A. On a professional level,
- 12 yes.
- 13 Q. I mean, other than seeing
- 14 their boats in marinas or at boat
- 15 shows.
- 16 A. Yes, sir, that's correct.
- 17 Q. Tell me about the process
- by which you were hired as an expert 18
- on behalf of the plaintiffs? What do 19
- 20 you recall about that?
- 21 A. Well, I was hired to come
- up. The first time I went up was for 22
- 23 Atlantic Mutual.
- 24 O. Yeah, I'm going to cover

- Laboratories, that were involved in
- 2
- 3 A. There was a competitive
- lab, Structural Composites, that did 4
- some similar testing at the time.
- 6 There's laboratories all over the
- country, Orange County, out in 7
- California; Broutman in Chicago. 8
- 9 A number of universities
- 10 will do some testing, but there
- really was only two that I recall
- 12 that specialized in marine
- 13 composites.
- 14 Q. And that was your lab and
- Structural Composites? 15
- A. That's correct. 16
- Q. And Structural Composites 17
- is Dr. Reichard's company?
- A. Yes, sir. 19
- 20 Q. Now, aside from this
- 21 engagement of Sigma Laboratories, a
- division of D.E. Jones, for testing
- in the late 1990s and your knowing
- the Healeys, prior to this engagement

- that. I'm actually in my mind I
- distinguish that from the work that
- 3 vou did --
- 4 A. Okay.
- 5 Q. - as an expert. But I
- will come up and do that. 6
 - Tell me what the first
- 7 contact was in which you were being 8
- engaged to provide expert opinion or 9
- 10 consulting services for the
- 11 plaintiffs in this lawsuit.
- A. I believe the very first 12
- contact was from Atlantic Mutual 13
- allowing me to share my records with 14
- 15 Viking and Post and Michel Weisz.
- 16 Q. Did Atlantic tell you why
- 17 they had agreed to allow you to share
- your records, what had prompted them 18
- 19 to do that?
- A. No. I don't believe they 20
- 21 did share that with me.
- Q. Did it surprise you that 22
- 23 you were being allowed to share these
- records or...



14 (Pages 50 to 53)

7

1 A. No.

.2 Q. What records did you have

50

- 3 to share?
- 4 A. Photographic records and
- 5 notes and a report that I wrote.
- Q. A report that you had 6
- written to Atlantic Mutual? 7
- 8 A Yes, sir.

11

- O. What was the conclusion of 9
- 10 that report to Atlantic Mutual?
 - A. Essentially I could not
- find any fault of the builder, the 12
- 13 manufacturer, and that it was my
- opinion that it was a material defect
- 15 on the part of the gel coat.
- 16 Q. And this report, what was
- 17 the date of it?
- 18 A. I don't recall, '04 or '05
- 19 Q. Do you recall whether this
- 20 report was ever shared by Atlantic
- 21 Mutual with anyone?
- A. No. I wouldn't know that, 22
- 23 Q. Do you know whether it was
- 24 ever shared with CCP?

52

- 1 A. I would have it in my
- 2 office, yes.
- 3 Q. And what was the basis for
- 4 your conclusion in your written
- 5 report to Atlantic Mutual that it was
- a material defect in the gel coat?
 - A. Well, I reviewed the
- 8 manufacturing procedures, their QA
- 9 procedures, their quality control
- procedures. I looked at Mr. 10
- Tortora's boat and the pattern of the 11
- 12 gel coat cracking phenomenon was not
- coincident with a structural issue. 13
- It wasn't a laminate issue. 14
- 15 And it did not appear to be a
- 16 production or a manufacturing issue,
- 17 a fabrication issue.
- 18 It was so random and so
- 19 widespread through a series of
- 20 processes, different fabrication
- processes, that the only common 21
- denominator really was the gel coat. 22
- 23 Q. So did you -- well, in
- describing what you considered, 24

51

- 1 A. I don't know that either.
- 2 Q. And you had this report in
- 3 your possession at the time that you
- were contacted by Atlantic Mutual and
- given permission to share your 5
- records with Viking?
- 7 A Yes sir
- O. And was this report 8
- provided to Viking? 9
- 10 A. I wouldn't know.
- Q. Well, did you share your 11
- 12 records with -
- A. Did I share? No. Not that 13
- 14 I know of, not that I could recall.
- 15 I don't understand.
 - Atlantic Mutual gave you
- 17 permission to share your records with
- 18 Viking?

16

- 19 A. They said that I could
- 20 assist in their endeavor.
- 21 Q. Okay. And did you share
- 22 this report with Viking?
- 23 A. I don't recall.
- 24 Q. Do you have this report?

you've identified those factors that

53

- were within Viking's control, 2
- 3 manufacturing procedures, QA
- procedures, laminate and so forth. 4
- 5 And from that you've
- 6 concluded that it was the gel coat.
 - Were you able to also
- 7 8 examine -- withdrawn. Let me do it
 - this way.

1

- 10 You've identified a number
- of factors as the basis for your 11
- opinion in your report to Atlantic 12
- Mutual that it was the gel coats a 1.3
- material defect on the part of the
- gel coat that caused the cracking in 15
- 16 the Tortora boat.
- 17 And you seem to have
- 18 addressed in your review, Viking's
- 19 manufacturing, QA, and construction
- 20 processes.
- 21 What about the care of the
- 22 boat once it was in Mr. Tortora's
- 23 possession? Did you analyze that?
- A. Yes. Yes, I did. 24

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

54

Q. What was the basis for your

analysis of that? 3

4

5

11

A. Well, it was -

Q. What did you look at?

A. What did I look at? Well,

I discussed with Mr. Tortora his care 6

for the boat, also Viking's 7

8 description of Mr. Tortora, which was

he was described as being quite fussy 9

about the appearance of the boat. 10

And the boat had been

12 covered during the winter. When it

was uncovered, the phenomenon 13

appeared. 14

15 I wasn't there so I don't

know if it was instantaneous or if it 16

was progressive. But I did section 17

the samples, the representatives

samples, from different areas that I

took on the boat. 20

21 And the gel coat failure

22 was only within the gel coat layer

and did not extend into the laminate. 23

O. That's not true for all the

56

A. There was a couple places 1

2 that I did, yes. 3

Q. But you didn't make a

systematic review of the Tortora 4

5 yacht for gel coat thickness?

6 A. No, sir. It was just 7

mainly in the sample areas. Q. Gel coat thickness can 8

cause gel coat cracking; is that

10 right?

9

2

13

17

11 A. That's correct.

 Q. That's a well-known fact, 12

13 isn't it?

14 A. I believe it is, yeah.

Q. And did you review - with 15

regard to your review of the 16

17 manufacturing procedures and the

18 quality control or quality assurance

procedures at Viking, what did you do 19

to review those procedures? 20

21 A. Well, I walked through the

22 plant. I saw their incoming raw

23 materials, QC procedures, where they

did it. I witnessed calibration of

55

1 samples.

2 Do you recall that?

A. Well, there was one sample 3

4 that it did go into the skin coat, I

5 believe.

Q. With regard to Mr. Tortora, 6

you didn't review any records that he 7

provided to you about how the boat 8

9 had been cared for, right? You spoke

10 to him?

A. Yeah. I spoke to him. 11

Q And you didn't review any 12

13 records relating to materials that

had been used on the boat by Mr.

Tortora or the marina where the boat 15

was stored? 16

17 A. No, sir.

Q. And did you review weather 18

19 records?

A. I only recall that it was a 20

21 very cold winter.

Q. Did you review the 22

thickness of the gel coat on the 23

Tortora yacht?

5.7

the guns, the spray guns.

I verbally went through

what their procedures were. I asked 3

them questions and they - you know, 4

this was something that was just a 5

6 O&A with them.

Q. Your walk-through of the 7

8 plant and your review of the

9 calibration of the guns, your

witnessing of that and your verbal 10

Q&A, all occurred in 2004, 2005 when 11

12 you were engaged?

A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. It didn't occur at the time

15 that the Tortora yacht was built; is

16 that right?

A. No, sir.

Q. Am I right?

18 19 A. That's correct.

Q. And at the time that you 20

21 spoke with Viking, walked through

their plant, and reviewed their QC 22

23 procedures and their materials

handling procedures, Viking was

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

7

58

financially interested in the results of your report; isn't that right? 2

Mr. Tortora was requesting

that the boat be fixed by Viking?

A. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

13

O. And they were financially 6 7

interested in the outcome of what you

8 were investigating; isn't that right?

A. I know they were

10 interested. What the reasons were

I'm not privy to.

12 Q. They stood - okay.

It mattered to Viking that

14 they not be held accountable for the

15 issues in the Tortora yacht?

16 A. Again, I'm not privy to

17 what they were thinking and I

18 wouldn't want to assume anything.

19 Q. Okay. Did Viking provide

20 to you in connection with your review

21 of their manufacturing procedures a

22 comprehensive list of issues related

to the manufacturing conditions at

the plant during the period when the

60

Were you provided documents 1 2

reflecting problems or manufacturing

3 condition problems in the Viking

4 plant during the time period when the

5 boat, the Tortora boat, was built as

6 part of your review?

A. I don't think I know what

8 you mean by manufacturing problems. 9

O When was the Tortora boat

10 built; do you know?

11 A. No. I don't recall off the

12 top of my head. 13

Q Let's do it this way.

14 MR BIZAR: Let's mark the

15 report. If you could hand it to me,

that would be helpful. 16

BY MR. BIZAR: 17

18 Q. I don't have a copy of your

19 report to Atlantic Mutual. I will

20 request that, but I don't have it

21 today so I'm somewhat constrained in

22 the questions I can put to you.

23 But I do have a copy of the

report that you've issued in this 24

59

- Tortora boat was built? 1
- 2 A. I don't - I'm not sure I
- 3 know what you mean.
- 4 Q. Did Viking provide to you
- 5 full access to all of their
- documentation of issues, problems,
- 7 conditions at their facility during
- 8 the period of time when the Tortora
- 9 boat was built?
- 10 A. They provided me anything
- 11 that I asked for and -
- 12 Q Did you ask for that
- 13 information?
- 14 A I asked if their procedures
- 15 had changed at all from the time that
- 16 the boat was built to the time that I
- 17 was there, and they said that their
- 18 equipment had remained pretty much
- 19 the same. Their procedures had
- 20 pretty much remained the same.
- 21 O. I'm asking you a slightly
- different question. I'm asking you
- 23 about manufacturing conditions in the
- 24 plant.

61

- case. And so I'm going to ask you to 1
- 2 look at it after we have it marked
- 3 and I'm going to ask you some
- 4 questions about it.
- 5 (Exhibit Jones 2 was marked
- 6 for identification.)
- 7 BY MR. BIZAR:

8

13

- O. Mr. Jones, the court
- 9 reporter has marked as Jones Exhibit
- 10 2 a copy of a three-page document
- 11 that is a letter to Michel Weisz
- 12 dated August 24, 2007.
 - Do you recognize this?
- 14 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 15 Q. And is that the report that
- 16 you issued in this case?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. Is that your signature on
- 19 the third page?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 O Now, the report refers on
- 22 the second page to the Tortora yacht
- 23 specifically.
 - Do you see that?



17 (Pages 62 to 65)

2

3

7

9

17

20

62

1 A Yes.

7

9

2 O. Viking VKY55-945 is a hull

3 number and that's the hull number

4 that corresponds with the Tortora

5 yacht; is that right?

6 A. That is correct.

Q. And that yacht has a name.

8 The name is Javelin; is that right?

A. I believe that's correct.

10 Q. Okay. And you refer in

11 this report, in the second full

12 paragraph on the second page, to the

13 global nature of the gel coat

14 cracking witnessed on the Tortora

15 yacht during your visit to New Gretna

16 where Viking has a facility.

17 Is that right?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. And that was your only

20 visit to see the Tortora yacht or did

21 you see it on other occasions?

2 A. I think that's the only one

23 that I recall.

24 Q. Did you see any other

64

1 Number 55-945; is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. You haven't sampled any of

4 the other Viking yachts that may be

5 the subject of claims in this case?

6 A. No, sir.

Q. Am I right?

8 A. That's correct.

Q. I'm sorry. I have to do

10 that to make sure we're on the same

11 page.

Now, have you – there's no

13 reference in the body of your report,

14 the three pages, to any Post Marine

15 yachts, right?

16 A. That's correct.

Q. Am I right that you have

18 not personally inspected any Post

19 Marine yachts?

A. That is also correct.

21 Q. And you have not sampled

22 any Post Marine yachts?

23 A. That is correct.

24 Q. Okay. You refer at the

63

1 Viking yachts that are the subject of

2 cracking claims in this litigation?

3 A. At the -- no.

4 Q. Have you ever, during the

time since you first started working

6 on this matter for Atlantic Mutual to

7 the time that you issued this report,

8 personally inspected any other Viking

9 yachts on which there's been gel coat

10 cracking that is the subject of the

11 claim in this case?

12 A. Just photographs. That's

13 it.

14 Q. The only yacht that you've

15 personally inspected was the Tortora

16 yacht, Hull Number 55-945, and you

17 did that in 2004, 2005 when you were

18 working on behalf of Atlantic Mutual;

19 is that right?

20 A. That is correct.

21 Q. And the only yacht that you

22 sampled, the only Viking yacht that

23 you sampled, from which you examined

samples, was the Tortora yacht, Hull

65

bottom of the second page of your

2 report to the sampling of the Hull

3 Number 55-945, the Tortora yacht; is

4 that right?

5 A. Yes.

6

Q. Let me just ask you a

7 question about that, if I may

8 MR. BIZAR: Let's just go

9 off the record for a second while I

10 look for a particular document.

11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going

12 off the video record. The time is

13 10:04 a.m.

14 (There was a pause in the

15 proceedings.)

16 MR. BIZAR: Let's go back

17 on the record.

18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on

19 the video record at 10:04 a.m.

20 BY MR BIZAR:

21 Q. Mr. Jones, I'm going to

22 have the court reporter mark as Jones

23 Exhibit 3 a two-page document that

24 appears to be an e-mail from Stephen

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

4

6

7

8

11

1

2

4

5

14

66

1 Murphy to you dated April 7, 2004.

(Exhibit Jones 3 was marked

3 for identification.)

4 BY MR. BIZAR:

Q You now have Jones Exhibit

6 3 in front of you. Would you take a

moment and look over this two-page

8 document and let me know when you're

9 through.

10 A. (Witness reviews exhibit.)

11 Okay.

2

5

12 Q. Exhibit 3 is an e-mail that

13 you received from Mr. Murphy; is that

14 right?

19

A. Yes, sir, it is.

16 Q. And Mr. Murphy was

17 associated with a company called

18 Castle Rock Risk.

Do you see that?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. And what was Castle Rock

22 Risk or what is it?

23 A. They were associated with

24 Atlantic Mutual in some form.

68

1 MR. BIZAR: Just show

2 laughter on the transcript.

3 BY MR. BIZAR:

Q. And Mr. Crivici worked for

5 Castle Rock as well?

A. I believe that was the

connection.

Q. And did he seem also

9 knowledgeable and professional about

10 what you were investigating?

A Yes, sir.

12 Q. Okay. And Mr. Murphy in

13 this e-mail to you was reporting on

14 the sampling from Motor Yacht

15 Javelin, which is Hull Number 55-945,

16 correct?

17 A. Correct.

18 Q. And that's the sampling, in

19 other words, the sampling that's

20 being referred to on April 7, 2004 in

21 this Exhibit 3 to your deposition is

22 the same sampling that you're

23 referring to in your report at the

24 bottom of page 2; is that right?

67

1 Q. And they were involved in

2 the investigation that you were

3 involved in with regard to the

4 cracking experienced in the Tortora

5 yacht, Hull Number 55-945; is that

6 right?

9

13

17

7 A. That's my understanding.

8 O. And did you ever meet Mr.

Murphy?

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. And what was his experience

12 or background? Do you know?

A. I don't recall.

14 Q. Did he seem professional

15 and knowledgeable about what he was

16 doing?

A. Oh, yes.

18 Q. And he worked with a fellow

19 name Claudio Crivici?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Did I pronounce it

22 correctly?

23 A. Your guess is as good as

24 mine.

69

A. That's correct.

Q. There's no other sampling

3 that's been done?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. And the eight samples that

are referenced here are the same

7 eight samples from the flybridge and

8 the port topside corner and the aft

9 deck hatch and the foredeck and the

10 transom that are referenced in your

11 report where you refer to the aft

12 deck hatch and the flybridge and the

13 Venturi and the transom, et cetera?

A. That's correct.

15 Q. And what did the sampling

16 involve, as you recall it?

17 A. Well, the sampling was

18 basically taking what we call a hull

19 saw. It's a saw blade. It's a

20 circular saw blade and it cuts out

21 what we call a plug. And it might be

22 an inch in diameter, might be two

23 inches in diameter or anywhere in

24 between.

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

70

And the idea on this one 1 was to just take the sample through 2 the affected area into the laminate, and I believe we just took the outer skin in the case of cord samples. I

don't recall that we went all the way 6 7 through.

8 But on the areas that were 9 single skin, such as the Venturi and 10 the flybridge combing and things of

that nature, those are single skin and we would have taken the whole

13 thing.

14 Q. And what did you do with 15 the samples once they were taken?

16 A. What I did is I sectioned

17 them and polished the edges and then inspected them under a microscope.

Q. So when you say optically 19 20 examined them, what you mean by

that - those are the terms you use

in your report - what you mean by

that is that you looked at them

through a microscope?

72

was a little bit off; is that right?

A. Yeah. Yes, sir, that's

3 correct.

2

9

11

4 Q. So in each case the crack

5 went all the way through the gel coat 6 into the skin coat with the exception

7 of only two that were in the gel

8 coat?

A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Right?

A. That is correct.

12 Q. And you then say, "When gel

13 coat cracks for whatever reason,

14 there's an energy that's released at

failure. This energy can travel into 15

the underlying laminate causing 16

damage to the laminate." 17

18 A. That's correct. 19

Q. Do you see that?

20 And then you say, "The six

21 samples which displayed damage to the

underlying skin coat laminate had no

visible voids, delamination or other 23

manufacturing defects that could have 24

71

A. Correct.

O. You eyeballed them, right? 2

3 A. Optically.

4 Q. Optically with the help of

a microscope? 5

6 A. Yes, sir.

7

Q. Okay. Now, in your

description of the samples, just so I

understand you, you say in each case

of these eight samples, in each case,

I'm reading from your report now,

"The gel coat crack extended through

13 the gel coat and into the skin coat

with the exception of two samples

which only displayed cracks through

16 the gel coat and not into the

17 laminate."

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. Does that refresh your

recollection -20

21 A. Yes, sir.

Q. - about how the samples -

23 A. It does.

22

Q. So earlier your testimony 24

73

caused the failures." 1

Do you see that?

A. Yes, sir.

2

3

7

4 Q. Now, is it your testimony

5 that those are the only kinds of

manufacturing or use or handling 6

conditions that can cause cracking of

8 gel coat into the laminate?

9 In other words, when you

10 say no visible voids, delamination or

other manufacturing defects, is it 11

12 your testimony that only visible

voids, delamination or other 13

manufacturing defects can cause 14

cracking through the gel coat and 15

16 into the laminate?

A. Well, very often a void, an 17

18 air void, let's take for an example,

19 that is a phenomena that occurs in

20 polyester boat building --

21 Q. Absolutely.

22 A. - quite readily.

23 Q. Yep.

24 A. And each air bubble is 20 (Pages 74 to 77)

74

actually an area for high stress

2 concentration.

3 Q. Yep.

4 A. Under load the stress will

5 go to a discontinuity and an air void

is a discontinuity. So in areas of

high stress that would be a site for

8 possible initial failure.

9 In this case, though it

10 was - there was no visible void

right at the end. 11

12 Now, when I say visible,

13 you know, I'm going down to about a

half a thousandths in diameter. So 14

that's actually pretty small. It

would take an electron microscope to

get down to the nano size. 17

18 Q. You didn't use an electron

19 microscope?

20 A. No, I did not. There's

manufacturing issues and there's 21

22 external issues.

23 O. Right.

24 A. So as far as manufacturing 76

Viking told you about their

manufacturing techniques?

3 A. No, no. That was just from

4 a visible inspection. Those type of

5 stress lines, if I will, are very

distinctive in their pattern. And -7

O. You didn't see that in

8 these particular samples? 9

A. No, no.

10 O. How are they distinctive?

What would you expect to see that you 11

didn't see? Do you recall? 12

A. Well, if it was stress -

no. If it was mechanical stress 14

15 related, say from pulling the part or

16 the part being impacted or the part

going through flexure or being too 17

limber, there would be very 18

19 distinctive stress lines that would

20 follow.

13

21 In the case of flexibility

22 being too flexible, the stress line

23 would manifest itself along the edges

of reinforcement, a frame, a

75

issues, there was nothing that really 1

2 jumped out at me. The thicknesses

3 were all appropriate. The

4 thicknesses of the gel coat were -

5 Q. The thicknesses in the

6 samples that you looked at?

7 A Yes. sir.

8 O. Okay.

9

A. They were appropriate. The

skin coat looked like it had been

11 well consolidated. The resin content

1.2 looked appropriate. Everything

looked, you know, fairly normal,

14 fairly consistent with what I would

expect out of -15

16 Q. Did you investigate the

17 possibility of impact stresses in

18 de-molding or other

19 manufacturing-type problems?

20 A. I considered those,

21 certainly.

24

Q. And you ruled them out? 22

A. Yes, sir. 23

Q. And that was based on what

77

bulkhead, something of that nature. 1

2 And they would be fairly linear.

3 The stress lines in a

4 panel, regardless of if it's a deck

5 panel or whatever, a bottom panel, a

6 hull side, whatever, those are

7 typically framed out with bulkheads

8 or stringers or any type of

9 stiffener.

10 And those are oriented

either longitudinally, typically 11

12 longitudinally or transversely in the

boat. And they have the - they are

14 the end – they provide the end

15 conditions for that panel.

16 Stress goes to the edge of

17 the panels. You don't normally find

18 it in the middle of a panel. It

19 would be at the edges where it's

20 constrained, where there's a hard

21 point.

22 So those lines, those

23 stress lines, would be linear, fairly

24 linear, parallel. They would 21 (Pages 78 to 81)

78

actually, in essence, outline the 2 structure.

3 In the case of an impact, 4 if it's a backside impact, like a bulkhead trying to push its way through the deck, or some sort of 6 backside impact, it would be a star 7

crack, very distinctive. 8 9

10

If it was a frontal impact, somebody dropping a heavy object onto the deck or a strike of some sort,

11 typically those are annular rings.

13 De-molding stress lines 14 would be along feature lines. They would be at the deck to the 15

superstructure, that connection

17 there, or a feature at the hull of the deck line or at the radius in the

bottom of the cockpit liner. 19

That's where they would be 20 and they would be very distinctive.

They would also be linear, and they would follow that feature, whatever

that feature is. That was not the

RΩ

skin coat, it's not a gel coat crack

2 that is simply confined.

3 It's not a crack that is 4 simply confined to the gel coat

layer, but it's a crack that extends

6 beneath the gel coat layer; is that 7 right?

8 A. Yes. Most of the cracking 9 that I've ever seen has extended into

10 the underlying laminate for some

11 reason.

12

13

24

Q. And in this case that was true for six of your eight samples?

A. That's correct. 14

Q. And the underlying laminate 15

is stronger in its constitution than 16

the gel coat layer; isn't that right? 17

18 A. In the fact that the gel

19 coat is unreinforced, yes. 20 Q. The gel coat is

unreinforced and it's applied 21

relatively thinly, correct? 22

23 A. That's correct.

Q. When it's properly applied,

79

case in this boat.

2 O. When you say in your report

that the gel coat crack extended through the gel coat and into the

skin coat for six of the samples, 5

that means that the crack was fairly 6

7 deep, correct?

> A. A gel coat layer's roughly 20 thousandths of an inch and the

9 skin coat might be 30 or 40 10

thousandths. So I guess that's a

12 relative number.

Q. What I mean is that the 13

crack goes beneath the gel coat into 15 the layers that are below the gel

16 coat?

17 MR. WEISZ: Object to the

18 form.

19 MR. BIZAR: Let me fix my

20 question.

21 BY MR. BIZAR:

22 Q. When you say in your report

23 that the gel coat crack extended

through the gel coat and into the

81

it should be - well, do you 1

recall -- do you know offhand what 2

the application guidelines are from

CCP for its 953 Series gel coat?

5 A. I believe it's 18 to 22

6 thousandths wet.

7 Q. So 18 plus or minus two

milliliters: is that right? 8 9

A. Yeah. 18 to 20.

10 Q. Okay. So as between the

gel coat and the underlying layers, 11

the underlying layers are

substantially stronger than the gel 13

14 coat; isn't that right?

A. Yes, sir.

15

22

Q. And the force that can be 16

exerted on the gel coat from the 17

underlying layers can be extreme; 18

19 isn't that right?

20 A. Yeah. It depends on the

21 load condition but I understand.

Q. You agree with my

23 statement? In other words, the

underlying layers are working against

82

an unreinforced, very thin skin, outer coat layer, the gel coat.

And when they're heated or 3 4 cooled, they expand and that - the consequence of that is pressure

against the gel coat; isn't that 7

right?

8 MR WEISZ: Object to the 9

form.

10

11

12

THE WITNESS: I don't know if I really follow you. The heating and expanding, what do you mean?

BY MR. BIZAR: 13 Q. Well, you understand that 14 15 materials have something called a

coefficient of thermal expansion,

17 right?

A. Correct. 18

19 O. And there may be a

20 different coefficient of thermal

expansion for the laminate than there .21

is for the gel coat? 22

23 A. Very possibly.

Q. And there could be even a 24

84

most likely an order of magnitude or two than the gel coat. I think your 2

3 question is whose responsibility is

4

5 Well, I mainly believe that 6 it's the gel coat manufacturer 7 because it would be like me putting

8 paint on steel.

9 You know, paint is a very thin coating. Steel is very rigid, 10

very strong, you know, and it would

be very analogous to spraying a thin 12 13

gel coat onto a heavily reinforced

14 fiberglass part.

The order of magnitude of 15 strength and stiffness is going to be 16 very similar. So you are applying a 17 18 coating onto something that is

19 purposely very rigid.

20 So I really think it's more

21 on the coating manufacturer's due

diligence to provide the best 22

23 material for the application. They

know what the application is.

83

disconnect between the coefficient of 1

thermal expansion for the laminate

3 and the gel coat in the sense that

the gel coat may not expand enough 4

5 when the laminate expands for the two

6 to work in harmony?

7 A. Or it could expand greater

8

11

12

9 O. Right. And either way

10 there could be an issue?

A. There could be.

Q. Whose responsibility is it

13 to determine whether the gel coat

works with a particular laminate

schedule, the gel coat manufacturer 15

16 or the boat manufacturer?

17 A. Well, laminate schedules

18 are quite wide in their application.

19 Everybody -- every builder has a

different thought as to what their

21 laminate schedule ought to be

Q. Correct. 22

23 A. Now, yes, I would agree

that the laminate is much stronger,

85

O. Okay. Well, let me ask you 1

2 a different set of questions that are 3 related to what we've just discussed.

CCP, as a gel coat

5 manufacturer, makes a gel coat that

6 is intended to be used in a wide

variety of marine applications,

8 right?

4

7

14

9 A. They have dozens of

10 formulations, yes.

11 Q. Let's take the 953 is

12 intended to work with a wide variety

13 of laminate schedules, right?

A. Correct.

15 Q. And CCP makes a gel coat

16 that it offers for sale and the

17 manufacturer is responsible for

18 building the boat, correct?

A. That's correct.

19 20 Q. And the manufacturer

21 decides whether that gel coat is

22 appropriate for its boat or not,

23 right?

24 A. Very often the builder will 23 (Pages 86 to 89)

rely on the formulator, the gel coat manufacturer, to give them the best 3 advice.

It's my experience that the people who develop the materials, whether it's gel coat or resin or whatever it is, know that product better than anybody else.

8 9 So, as a builder, you go to 10 your resin supplier, your gel coat supplier, and you say, listen, this 12 is my application. This is what I am

13 intending to do. What's your best 14 idea? This is what I'm looking for.

What do you think? 15

4

5

6

7

16 And because the gel coat 17 manufacturer, and in this case, CCP, is very well respected in the 19 industry for producing a fine 20 product.

21 They've produced

22 documentation that is used worldwide

23 as a guide on the application and

troubleshooting of gel coats.

88

supplier? 1

2 A. Well, it's ultimately the 3 manufacturer's - the builder's

4 responsibility to say, yes, I am

5 going to buy that product.

6 But I don't know -- I can't 7 recall of any builder that I've

worked with that doesn't consult with 8

9 either the resin supplier or the gel

10 coat supplier or even the

reinforcement supplier. 11

12 Q. And you've worked with 13 builders who have done testing on

their materials as well? 14

A. Oh, certainly. But I don't 15 know of anybody that doesn't call up 16

the manufacturer, have the 17

manufacturer or the supplier come in 18

19 and say, gee, you know, I'm looking

20 for this color and it's got to be

brilliant, it's got to last, you've

got to use good pigments, you've got 22

23 to - you know, this is a boat. 24

It's going to go out in the

87

So when you go to somebody

like this, you would – it's been my 2 experience to bring the supplier in 3

4 early.

13

Q. Maybe if they had had you 5

helping them, it would have not 6 7

worked out the way it did. Let me

ask you this question. 8

9 A. Well, I don't know.

O. Does CCP have control over 10

the manufacturer's laminate schedule 11

12 or does the manufacturer?

A. Oh, the manufacturer does.

14 O. And does the manufacturer

15 have control over the materials that

16 they use or does CCP? I mean, you

mentioned -17

A. I'm sorry. What materials? 18

Q. You mentioned advice and 19

20 consultation and working with

21 somebody.

22 Who decides what materials

the manufacturer is going to use, the

manufacturer or the material

industry. And the marine industry

produces thousands of boats per week.

3 Q. You haven't done any

testing of CCP's gel coat for

purposes of this report, in other 5

words, for purposes of the opinions 6

that you've issued as of August 2007; 7

8 is that right? 9

A. For this report, no.

10 Q. And you haven't done any

testing comparing 953 versus 952 gel 11

coat or any other CCP gel coat 12

formulations for purposes of this 13

14 report; is that right?

A. For the purposes of this

16 report, that's correct.

Q. And you haven't analyzed 17

18 the gel coat formulation of the 953

19 or the 952 gel coats for purposes of

20 this report?

15

21 A. No, sir.

Q. Am I right?

22 23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. And you haven't analyzed 90

- the gel coat chemistry of CCP's gel
- 2 coat for purposes of this report?
- 3 A. No. I'm not a chemist.
- 4 Q. So your conclusion that
- 5 it's a material defect in the gel
- 6 coat basically was arrived at by
- 7 eliminating other possible causes by
- 8 a process of elimination; is that
- 9 right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir. And historical
- 11 evidence.
- 12 Q. And historical evidence is
- 13 the evidence of Viking's experience
- 14 with prior series of gel coat, is
- 15 that it?
- 16 A. No. It's actually an
- 17 industry-wide issue, you know,
- 18 performance.
- 19 Q. I don't understand what you
- 20 mean.
- 21 A. Well, this is --
- 22 Q. This is a unique situation;
- 23 is that what you're saying?
- 24 A. This is an incredibly

92

- 1 You've only seen one boat,
- 2 which is the Tortora yacht, with this
- 3 problem personally, correct? In
- 4 other words, you haven't -
- 5 A. For this case?
- 6 Q. Yes.
 - A. For the Viking/Post versus
- 8 CCP-

7

9

- Q. Yes.
- 10 A. there's only one boat
- 11 that I looked at, yes.
- 12 Q. And you've never seen a
- 13 Post boat -
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. personally?
- 16 A. Well, for this case.
- 17 Q. Right. And have you ever
- 18 been to the Post manufacturing
- 19 facility for this case?
- 20 A. No. I witnessed some video
- 21 application.
- 22 Q But you didn't make a
- 23 personal visit or inspection of the
- 24 Post --

2

7

91

- 1 unique situation. I've only seen it
- 2 one time before.
- 3 Q. And we'll get to that one
- 4 time before but let me just make sure
- 5 I understand you.
- 6 When you say that this is
- 7 an incredibly unique situation, you
- 8 say that you're referring to the
- 9 gel coat cracking of a nature of
- 10 the nature described in your report
- 11 is a unique situation?
- 12 A. Well, it's yes. It's so
- 13 global in nature and it encompasses
- 14 different manufacturing processes
- 15 from closed mold to open mold to
- 16 resin transfer, a wide number of
- 17 laminate schedules.
- 18 Essentially every part
- 19 exposed on the outside of the boat
- 20 had cracks in it, and that was
- 21 extraordinary. You know, like I say,
- 22 I've only seen it one other time.
- 23 Q. Okay. We'll get to the one
- 24 other time.

- 1 A. No, I didn't.
 - Q manufacturing facility?
- 3 A No, I didn't
- 4 Q. And you didn't go to Post
- 5 and review documents at Post?
- 6 A. No, sir, I didn't.
 - MR. BIZAR: We need to
- 8 change the tape so let's do that.
- 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going
- 10 off the video record. The time is
- 11 10:28 a.m. This is the end of tape
- 12 one.
- 13 (A break was taken at this
- 14 time)
- 15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on
- 16 the video record at 10:37 a.m. This
- 17 is the start of tape two.
- 18 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 19 Q. So in your testimony a
- 20 couple moments ago that the situation
- 21 that you've seen in the Tortora yacht
- 22 is unique, am I to understand that
- you haven't seen any such situationin other instances where CCP gel coat

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

94 96 has been involved? 1 it 2 A. No, no. It's just A. Yes, I have. 2 something that I had seen before. O. You have seen it in other 3 3 instances? Q. In the field have you seen 4 A. Yes. 5 an instance of this gel coat cracking 5 6 comparable to what you saw in the Q. Okay. What are those other 6 7 Tortora boat before? '7 instances? 8 A. Well, it was just one. 8 A. No. 9 Q. Okay. 9 Q. When was this work that you 10 A. And it was did with the boat that you post cured 10 Q. So the one other time 11 in an oven? 11 before was a CCP gel coat? 12 A. 2002. 12 A. Yes, sir, it was. 13 Q. Did you contact CCP as the 13 14 Q. Okay. Tell me about that. 14 gel coat manufacturer about that A. Well, this was something 15 situation? 15 16 that I caused. It was something that 16 A. No. I knew why it I actually did intentionally but it 17 happened. wasn't - I didn't anticipate the 18 Q. And why did it happen? 19 A. Different coefficients of phenomena. And this was a case where I had built a boat and then post 20 thermal expansion. Q. As between the gel coat and 21 cured it in an oven. 21 the laminate? 22 And when it came out of the 22 23 oven, the gel coat was globally A. Yes, sir. cracked and the phenomena looked very 24 Q. And did the cracking in 97 95 that case occur immediately? 2 A. Oh, yes. O. It didn't take four or five 3 4 years to develop? 5 A. No. Q. And is it your understanding that with regard to the Tortora boat, the cracking took 8 9

1	similar to what I saw with the
2	Tortora boat It was so extensive
3	and so extraordinary.
4	Q. What was the gel coat in
5	question that was used in that
6	instance?
7	 A. It was the Armorflex gel
8	coat and I don't remember the exact
9	batch or product code number.
10	Q. Was it 953, 952?
11	 A. Yeah. I think it was the
12	953.
13	Q. Do you know one way or the
14	other?
15	A. I could look it up in my
16	records, but, as I sit here today,
17	no, I don't recall.
18	Q. Is that the basis for your
19	opinion in this report? That
20	information is not disclosed in your
21	report and it's not disclosed in your

documents so I want to know if that's

the basis for your opinion in any way because I'm going to move to strike

several years to develop? A. That's my understanding. Q. The Tortora boat was built in 1999? A. It was a 2000 year model. Q. 2000 year model? A. But it was started near the end of '99. Q. And the cracking was pointed out in 2004; is that right? A. I believe so. I believe that was the date. Q. In your situation that you described in your plant, the cracking resulting from different coefficients of thermal expansion occurred

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

98

- 1 immediately as opposed to the Tortora
- 2 situation where cracking of the gel
- 3 coat occurred a number of years
- 4 later?
- 5 A. Yes. Some of it did happen
- 6 immediately, but some of it was
- 7 progressive.
- 8 Q. But some of it at least
- 9 happened immediately?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Did you issue a report or
- 12 do anything in connection with
- 13 that --
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. boat?
- 16 A. No, sir.
- 17 Q. Did you repair the boat?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. How did you do that?
- 20 A. I stripped the gel coat off
- 21 and repainted it.
- 22 Q. And what did you repaint it
- 23 with?
- 24 A. It was an allgrip U.S.

100

- 1 A. Yes, I do.
- 2 Q. And you were provided in
- 3 this case some CCP documents
- 4 referring to cracking situations,
- 5 right?

7

9

- 6 A. Yes. Yes, I was.
 - Q. MasterCraft, Skier's Choice
- 8 are some such situations.
 - A. I remember those.
- 10 Q. And those cracking
- 11 instances have nothing to do with
- 12 your opinion here?
- 13 A No.
- 14 Q. Isn't that right?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. In other words, those
- 17 situations are not this same unique
- 18 situation that you've described?
- 19 A. Not at all.
- 20 Q. Those are normal instances
- 21 of cracking that can be identified as
- 22 caused by something specific?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. Okay. Now, the opinion

99

- 1 Paints product. It was an LPU that
- 2 we used.
- 3 Q. You didn't reapply gel
- 4 coat?
- 5 A. No, sir.
- 6 Q. Now, you understand that
- 7 CCP from time to time gets reports of
- 8 gel coat cracking by various
- 9 customers, right?
- 10 A. I would have to assume
- 11 that.
- 12 O. You would assume that
- 13 because all manufacturers get gel
- 14 coat cracking reports; isn't that
- 15 right?
- 16 A. I would assume that, too.
- 17 I'm not a gel coat manufacturer, so
- 18 I'm not privy.
- 19 Q. But you know that gel coat
- 20 cracking is a common phenomenon in
- 21 the marine industry?
- 22 A. Very common.
- 23 Q. And, in fact, you say that
- 24 in your report.

101

- 1 that you've reached in this case is
- 2 based, as you put it, on your
- 3 examination of the Tortora boat and
- historical knowledge, right?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- 6 Q. And you've extrapolated
- 7 from your examination of the Tortora
- 8 boat to other Viking boats and to all
- 9 the Post boats; isn't that right?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. You haven't done any work
- 12 on these other boats yourself?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. It's purely by
- 15 extrapolation?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. Okay. Now, with regard to
- 18 the Tortora boat, are you certain
- 19 that Viking provided you with all the
- 20 information relevant to that boat?
- 21 A. I wouldn't know.
- 22 Q. Okay. Let me mark a
- 23 document. Let me do it this way.
 - In your report you identify



27 (Pages 102 to 105)

5

20

102

- 1 on a reference list the materials
- 2 that you consulted in connection with
- 3 your work.

7

- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 O. And there are no Post
- 6 Marine documents listed.
 - A. That's right.
- 8 Q. So you didn't consult any
- 9 Post Marine documents; is that right?
- 10 A. I didn't have any, no.
- 1 Q. And there are only very few
- 12 Viking documents.
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 Q. Is that because you didn't
- 15 have any of those documents either?
- 16 A. Those were the ones that I
- 17 referred to specifically. I would
- 18 have to say that I read a raft, a
- 19 couple of banker boxes full of
- 20 documents.
- 21 Q. These are the ones you -
- 22 A. But those are the ones that
- 23 were specific to what I was
- 24 investigating, yes.

104

- 1 Q. And the training of the
- 2 people who do the application of the
- 3 gel coat is something that's
- 4 important as well?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. And ensuring that the
- 7 people who do the gel coat
- 8 application properly is important
- 9 also, correct?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. And the manufacturer has
- 12 control over the gel coat
- 13 application, not CCP as a gel coat
- 14 materials supplier?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. In other words, it's done
- 17 in the boat building facility, not in
- 18 CCP's factories, right?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
 - MR. BIZAR: We'll mark this
- 21 as Jones 4 I think.
- 22 (Exhibit Jones 4 was marked
- 23 for identification.)
- 24 BY MR BIZAR:

103

- Q. Did you ignore documents
- 2 that were maybe contradictory to your
- 3 position?

5

- 4 A. No. No.
 - MR BIZAR: Let me mark
- 6 this document.
- 7 BY MR BIZAR:
- 8 Q. So why is it that gel coat
- 9 thickness can cause gel coat
- 10 cracking?
- 11 A. If it's too thick, it's a
- 12 brittle, unreinforced layer, fairly
- 13 thin, not very strong.
- 14 Q. And why then does it crack?
- 15 A. Well, if it's thick, it's
- 16 even more brittle than a thin layer.
- 17 And being a thicker, unreinforced
- 18 layer, it is more prone to cracking.
- 19 Q. So the application of gel
- 20 coat in accordance with the gel coat
- 21 manufacturer's specifications is
- 22 something that's important.
- 23 Would you agree?
- 24 A. Oh, certainly.

105

- Q. I'm going to hand to you a
- 2 document that was marked at one of
- 3 the Viking depositions and it is a
- 4 multiple-page document that has some
- 5 boat dimensions on it.
- 6 The boat referenced is
- 7 55-945 and it has a variety of
- 8 measurements of gel coat thickness,
- 9 which I will represent to you have
- 10 been testified about by Viking
- 11 witnesses.
- 12 Take a moment, look it
- 13 over.
- 14 A. (Witness reviews exhibit.)
- 15 Q. Let me ask you, you didn't
- 16 review any deposition testimony of
- 17 any of the Viking witnesses; is that
- 18 right?

- 19 A. No, I don't believe I have.
 - Q And you didn't you've
- 21 never seen Exhibit 4 before today -
- 22 A. No.
- 23 Q. is that right?
- 24 A. That's correct.



106

- 1 Q. And if I represent to you
- 2 that these numbers shown on Exhibit 4
- 3 are measurements of gel coat
- thickness on the Tortora boat, at
- various parts of the Tortora boat,
- 6 does that seem to comport with what
- 7 the document says?
- 8 You can look through the
- 9 document.
- 10 A. Yeah. I don't know how
- 11 they took the measurements but, yeah,
- 12 this would be...
- 13 Q. Let me do it this way.
- 55-945 is the Tortora boat, 14
- 15 right?
- A. Yes, sir. 16
- 17 Q. Okay. And in the
- lower-right corner there's something 18
- 19 that says VK. That means it comes
- 20 from the Viking files.
- 21 And you see Viking listed
- 22 on a number of these pages, right?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. And you understand that

108

- referring to.
- 2 Q. So that's the forward deck?
- 3 A. And, yes, that's the
- 4 forward deck.

5

7

- O. And that's page 3602?
- 6 A. 3602, correct.
 - Q. See, you're so experienced
- 8 you know exactly where to look for
- 9 the page number.
- 10 And then page 3603 is the
- 11 deckhouse?
- 1.2 A. This would be the
- deckhouse, correct. 13
- 14 Q. Okay. And you see written
- 15 on a number of these pages, including
- the page we're on, 3603, "55-945 TC 16
- thickness," right? 17
- 18 A. Okav.
- 19 Q. Do you see that?
- 20 A. TC thickness.
- 21 Q. On the right side in
- 22 handwriting?
- 23 A. Yes, I do see that.
- 24 Q. And then you see on the

107

- this is an outline of the Tortora
- 2 boat?
- 3 A. This looks like an outline
- of the hard top, yes. 4
- 5 Q. Right. And then the second
- page is an outline of the port 6
- passage, open flybridge? 7
- A Yes, sir. 8
 - Q. And the third page, do you
- see what that is an outline of or can
- you tell me what that would be an
- 12 outline of?

9

- A. That looks like the back of 13
- 14 the superstructure.
- 15 Q. Okay. And the fourth page,
- 16 what would that be an outline of, the
- forward deck? 17
- 18 A. That would be the
- 19 deckhouse, not the deck itself.
- 20 Q. And then the next page,
- page 3603, what would that be an 21
- 22 outline of?
- 23 A. Wait a minute. I'm sorry.
- I missed the page that you were

1.09

- prior page the words "TC thickness"? 1
 - A. Yes.
- 2 3 Q. Right? And then the page
- 4 before that says "thickness," right?
 - A. Yes.
- 5 6 Q. So can you understand this
 - document as referring to gel coat
- 8 thickness?

- 9 A. If the numbers relate to
- 10 gel coat thickness, I can understand
- 11 the documents.
- 12 Q. And the measurements here
- 13 are in many respects, not all
- respects but in many respects 14
- 15 substantially higher than 18 plus or
- 16 minus two milliliters. Would you
- 17 agree?
- 18 A. Yes. Not uncommon.
- 19 Q. Whether common or uncommon,
- the measurements on this boat, the
- 21 Tortora yacht, which experienced
- 22 global cracking, are in many respects
- 23 substantially higher than 18 plus or
- 24 minus two milliliters?



29 (Pages 110 to 113)

110 112 application he would use the gauge to 1 Yes. In some respects, 2 determine where they were and.... 2 3 Q. That was something that you 3 Q. I mean, if you look at page 3601 on the right column, are you 4 saw personally? 4 5 A. Yes, sir. 5 with me? 6 Q. But you didn't see it at A. Yes. 6 7 7 Q. 35, 34, 40, 33, 42, 62, 80. the time that the Tortora yacht was 8 Do you see those 8 made because you're not a time 9 measurements? 9 traveler; isn't that right? 10 10 A. That's correct. A. Yes. 11 Q. And you didn't see it at 11 Q. And on the opposite side you have 36, 38, 26. the time the other yachts that are at 12 13 Do you see those 13 issue in this case were made because measurements? 14 you didn't go back in time to see 14 A. Yes, I do. 15 those yachts when they were built? 15 Q. And then on the next page, 16 A. No. I haven't developed 16 17 some of the places are 34, 26, 34, 17 that technique yet. Q. Okay. Something that only 18 28. 18 happens on TV apparently. 19 Do you see that? 19 20 A. Yes. 20 Now, let me - and you 21 Q. And on the page after that 21 didn't see any yacht building techniques at Post, did you? 22 you have measurements all over the 22 23 A. No, I didn't. 23 map from 17 all the way up to 42. 24 24 Do you see that? Q. Now, during the course of

111

A. Yes, I do. Q. So these - assuming that these are gel coat thickness measurements on the Tortora yacht, these measurements are substantially thicker than the manufacturer's specifications, yes or no? '7 8 A. A portion of them are, yes. 9 Q. Okay. And in your investigation of manufacturing processes at Viking, what attention did you pay to gel coat thickness in 13 the application of gel coat, 953 14 Series gel coat, to Viking yachts 15 other than the Tortora yacht? 16 A. Well, in the application it 17 was pretty much a standard procedure 18 for the gel coat operator or one of 19 his helpers to have a gel coat 20 thickness gauge. 21 Q. A wet gauge, a mil gauge?

A. A mil gauge called a wet

film thickness gauge or gel gauge. And, you know, at points during their 113

your investigation into this problem, did you have a chance to look at a 3 variety of CCP documents? 4 A. Oh, yes. 5 Q. And CCP reports on inspections and CCP reports on tests? 6 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Did you at any time in your 9 review of those documents think that the CCP people writing those documents were anything other than 11 honest and truthful in their 12 depiction of what they had seen or 13 14 done? 15 A. Are we talking about their 16 in-house test documents and QA 17 documents -Q. Yes. 18 19 A. - and formulation 20 documents -21 Q. Yes. 22 A. - and things of that 23 nature? Yes.

Q. You thought they were

24

114

- 1 honest and truthful in the reporting
- 2 of those results?
- 3 MR. WEISZ: Object to the
- 4 form.
- 5 THE WITNESS: I would
- 6 assume so. I hate to assume but....
- 7 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 8 Q. Let me give you the
- 9 question a different way and try and
- 10 cure my problem that Mr. Weisz has
- 11 objected to.
- Have you any information to
- 13 suggest to you that the CCP personnel
- 14 recording test results were anything
- 15 other than honest and truthful in
- 16 their recording of those results
- 17 based on the documents you reviewed?
- 18 A. Well, based on the
- 19 documents and based on my experience
- 20 with CCP and certain personnel from
- 21 CCP, I have always respected them as
- 22 being professional and upright and
- 23 honest.
- 24 Q. Thank you. And with regard

116

- 1 (Exhibit Jones 5 was marked
- 2 for identification.)
- 3 BY MR. BIZAR:
 - Q. I've placed in front of you
- 5 a

4

9

- 6 A. Can I say something with
- 7 respect to this document here?
- 8 Q. The Tortora boat document?
 - A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. Meaning Exhibit 4?
- 11 A. Correct, Exhibit 4.
- 12 Q. Is it in response to one of
- 13 my questions? Are you amending an
- 14 answer?
- 15 A. No. I'm not amending an
- 16 answer.
- 17 Q. Okay. The way -
- 18 A. It's just an observation
- 19 that I had
- 20 Q. The way no. The answer
- 21 is you can't.
- 22 A Okay.
- 23 Q. You don't get to just
- 24 speak. You have to answer the

115

- 1 to CCP inspection reports on boats
- 2 that they inspected that you may have
- 3 seen in the course of your
- 4 investigation in this matter, did you
- 5 ever see any inspection reports, any
- 6 root cause analyses prepared by CCP
- 7 that were anything other than honest
- 8 and truthful?
- 9 MR. WEISZ: Object to the
- 10 form.
- 11 THE WITNESS: They appeared
- 12 so.
- 13 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 14 Q. You have no reason to
- 15 believe that they weren't being
- 16 truthful?
- 17 A. They all seemed to be
- 18 one-sided but I would I believe
- 19 they reported what they saw and what
- 20 they believed.
- 21 Q. Thank you.
 - MR BIZAR: Let's mark as
- 23 the next Jones document which is
- 4 Exhibit 5.

22

117

- 1 questions.
- 2 A. Okay.
- 3 Q With regard to I showed
- 4 you the Tortora boat thickness
- 5 measurements in Exhibit 4. Let me
- 6 show you Exhibit 5, which I'll
- 7 represent to you is a three-page
- 8 document produced from CCP in this
- 9 case. Take a moment and look it
- 10 over.
- 11 A. (Witness reviews exhibit.)
- 12 Okay.

15

- 13 Q. Have you seen this Exhibit
- 14 5 before?
 - A. I may have
- 16 Q. It's not a document that's
- 17 listed on your list of documents
- 18 reviewed or relied on?
 - A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. This refers to a boat
- 21 manufactured by Post using, among
- 22 other things, 953 Series gel coat.
- 23 Do you agree?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.

31 (Pages 118 to 121)

118

- Q. And that's reflected on the part inspection form on the second
- 3 page, right?

4

- A. That's correct.
- 5 O. And there's a reference to
- the summary of what the CCP technical 6
- 7 service representative found on this
- 8 boat, is there not?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And the reference refers to 10
- 11 the gel coat being 70 to 75
- milliliters thick, correct?
 - A. Mils is not milliliters but
- 14 it's -
- 15 Q. I'm sorry. Millimeters?
- A. Millimeters 16
- MR. WEISZ: No. It's not 17
- millimeters either. 18
- 19 THE WITNESS: No, no, no.
- It's pardon me? I'm sorry. It's
- actually a term for thousandths of an 21
- 22 inch
- 23 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 24 Q. Okay. Let me correct it.

120

- for identification.)
- 2 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 3 Q. Jones Exhibit 6 is a
- 4 two-page document from Viking files
- that's a series of e-mails dated on
- 6 or around May 20, 2005 with regard to 7
 - a boat that's being examined.
- 8 And the boat has a hard top
- 9 that was made with CCP's 953WK227
- 10 Snow White gel coat.
 - Do you see that?
- 12 A. Yes.

11

- 13 Q. It's at the bottom.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. The e-mail exchange is
- between Mr. Kasinski, Mr. Beltran and 16
- 17 Bill Heller, right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. And Mr. Kasinski asks Mr.
- 20 Heller whether the cracking was due
- to the CCP gel coat or was it applied 21
- 22 too heavy.
- 23 Do you see that?
- 24 A. I see that.

- A. 75 thousandths of an inch. 1
- Q. It refers to the gel coat 2
- 3 being 70 to 75 thousandths of an inch
- 4 thick?
- 5 A. Yes, sir, it does.
- O. And that's substantially 6
- thicker than 18 plus or minus two
- 8 mils. Would you agree?
 - A. I would agree.
- Q. And you never inspected 10
- visually, yourself, or optically
- examined, to use your terminology,
- any Post Marine boat at issue in this 13
- case? 14

9

- 15 A. No, I never have.
- 16 Q. And you have no reason to
- believe that this inspection report 17
- is false or flawed in any way?
- 19 A. I have no reason to believe 20 that.
- 21 Q. Let me show you some other
- 22 documents, if I may.
- 23 MR BIZAR: This is 6.
- 24 (Exhibit Jones 6 was marked

- Q. And the answer from Mr. 1
- 2 Heller to Mr. Kasinski was, "John,
- yes, there was an excessive amount of
- gel coat film thickness in certain
- 5 areas."
- 6 Do you see that?
 - A. I do.
- 7 8 Q. And, as we discussed,
- thickness can cause gel coat 9
- 10 cracking?
- A. Yes, it can. 11
- O. And this is a boat that you 12
- haven't examined before? 13
- 14 A. That is also correct.
- Q. And you've not seen this 15
- document before; is that also 16
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. Not to my recollection.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- 20 MR BIZAR: Let's mark this
- 21 one and the next one, the two pages.
- 22 (Exhibit Jones 7 was marked
- 23 for identification.)
- 24 BY MR. BIZAR:

32 (Pages 122 to 125)

122

- 1 Q. Mr. Jones, I've handed you
- 2 Exhibit 7, which is a two-page
- 3 document with Viking Bates Numbers
- 4 dated as of January 19, 2000. Take a
- 5 moment and look that over.
- 6 A. (Witness reviews exhibit.)
- 7 Okay.
- 8 Q. Have you seen this document
- 9 before?
- 10 A. Not to my recollection.
- 11 Q. And you know who Juan
- 12 Beltran is at Viking?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. He writes in this document,
- 15 "Please be advised," all in capitals,
- 16 and again the text of the document is
- 17 in capitals, "We have a problem with
- 18 the thickness of gel coat in our
- 19 fiberglass parts and I spoke with you
- 20 guys before.
- 21 "It looks like nothing is
- 22 being done. This time you're going
- 23 to sign this note, signature."
- 24 Do you see that?

124

- 1 THE WITNESS: That's what
- 2 it appears.

4

9

- 3 BY MR BIZAR:
 - Q And, again, this is a
- 5 document that you don't recall seeing
- 6 in connection with your
- 7 investigation?
- 8 A. That's correct.
 - Q Let's move on from
- 10 thickness to another topic related to
- 11 manufacturing, if we may.
- Would you agree with me
- 13 that moisture is a factor in the
- 14 manufacture of fiberglass parts that
- 15 could affect the performance of those
- 16 parts in the field?
- 17 A. Yes, it can
- 18 (Exhibit Jones 8 was marked
- 19 for identification.)
- 20 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 21 Q. Let me hand to you what
- 22 we've had the court reporter mark as
- 23 Exhibit 8 to your deposition. It's a
 - 4 one-page Viking document. Take a

123

- I A. Yes, I do.
- 2 O. And there's a signature by
- 3 a Mr. James Parker and then there's a
- 4 signature as well on the second page,
- 5 which is identical, by Ramon
- 6 Quinones.
- 7 Do you see that?
- 8 A. Yes, 1 do.
- 9 Q. And, again, thickness can
- 10 cause gel coat cracking?
- 11 A. Yes, it can.
- 12 Q. And this document is dated
- 13 as of 2000, the year 2000?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 O. And it refers back to a
- 16 conversation that Mr. Beltran may
- 17 have had with these individuals prior
- 18 to that time?
- 19 MR. WEISZ: Object to the
- 20 form.
- 21 BY MR. BIZAR:
- Q. Does it not?
- 23 MR. WEISZ: I still object
- 24 to the form.

125

- 1 moment and look it over
- 2 A. (Witness reviews document.)
- 3 Okay.
- 4 Q. This is a memorandum, an
- 5 e-mail memorandum, by Juan Beltran to
- 6 Stan Blair with carbon copies to
- 7 others. It refers in handwriting in
- 8 the upper right corner to a licking
- 9 problem. I think he means leaking
- 10 problem.
- 11 Would you agree with that,
- 12 based on the text of the memo?
 - A. Yes. I see where it says
- 14 leaking.

- 15 Q. It says, "Subject: Water
- 16 Leak" and then it refers in the text
- 17 to leaking, correct?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. The text is "The roof over
- 20 the 48 hull mode" -
- 21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're
- 22 going off the video record. The time
- 23 is 11:05.
- 24 (There was a pause in the

126

proceedings because of a technical

difficulty.)

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on

4 the video record. The time is

5 11·11 a m

7

BY MR. BIZAR: 6

Q. The text of Exhibit 8 of

8 the e-mail message itself refers

9 to - is as follows: "The roof over

10 the 48 hull mode is leaking bad. I

11 have spots in the skin coat from the

12 water that we had to grind out on

48431. 13

14 "This could cause problems

later. We have made a lot of work 15

orders and I send o e-mail to Frank

Moser on 8-16-03 about this

situation. Could you please look

into this situation? 19

20 "We also have a lot of

21 other leaks over other hull molds

with 5 gallon pails. We made work

orders and e-mail for the 56 hull

24 mode and 45 hull mode have the same

128

exhibit, Exhibit 9, is "Leaks on the

roof in Viglass," which means 2

3 fiberglass?

A. I-

4

5

7

O. You don't know?

6 A. That I don't know.

Q. Okay. It's another e-mail

message from Juan Beltran to various

9 people complaining about leaks in

10 their manufacturing area; is that

11

12 A. Yes. This does say, "licks

13 on the ruff" - ruff.

14 Q. Mr. Beltran's native

language is not English, but you get 15

16 the sense of it?

17 A. I get the gist of the

18 message.

19 Q. And they're talking about

dripping water on top of lamination

damaging the body and it needs to be 21

22 fixed.

20

1

23 Do you see that?

24 A. Yes, I see that.

127

"Could you please look into 2

3 the situation, please. Thank you,

Juan Beltran." 4

5

7

13

24

Do you see that?

6 A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that's a document that

you didn't see in connection with 8

9 your investigation -

10 A. No.

11 Q. - into manufacturing at

Viking, correct? 12

A. That's correct.

14 MR BIZAR: Let's mark the

15 next exhibit.

(Exhibit Jones 9 was marked 16

for identification.) 17

18 BY MR. BIZAR:

Q. Jones Exhibit 9 is a 19

one-page document from Viking's 20

files. Take a moment and look that 21

22 through.

23 A. (Witness reviews exhibit.)

Q. The subject of this

129

Q. And you don't know if

problems like the problem described

in Exhibit 9 or Exhibit 8 existed in 3

4 prior years?

A. No. I don't know if it was

5 6 prior or during the construction of

any of the boats.

7 8 Q. Or subsequent?

9 A. Or subsequent. No, I

10 don't.

11 You didn't see this

12 document as part of your

investigation? 13

14 A. No.

15 MR. BIZAR: Let's go to the

16 next one.

20

17 (Exhibit Jones 10 was

marked for identification.) 18

19 BY MR. BIZAR:

Q. Jones Exhibit 10 is a

21 four-page document from Viking's

22 files as well dated March 23, 2005.

23 The subject is the "Roof Leaking

Water" and there are pictures

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

130

attached to the e-mail message

pointing out the places on the roof. 2

They're not the clearest

pictures but pointing out the places 4

on the roof presumably where there 5

6 are leaks.

3

7

8

A. Yes, I see that.

Q. And it states, "Frank, the

9 roof on top of the 52 hull mold is

10 leaking water really bad. We have

work orders made. You fixed this 11

12 before and it's still leaking water.

13 "We need this to be done 14 again and properly so we don't have

to deal with warranty issues later 15

16 on.

17 "I hope this could be done

as soon as possible. I'm sending you 18 pictures of the leak and what's being

19 damage. If you have any questions,

let me know. This is very hot. It

needs to be done right away. 2.2

Thanks." 23

24 Do you see that? 132

conditions at the Viking plant and

2 referring to specifically plastic in

the egg crate area and issues with 3

4 the dust collectors because - and

5 I'm reading, I'm quoting it now,

6 "Because we have a big problem with

the dust when we patch in gel coating 7

and allgrip, this machines blow air 8

9 and dust all over the place and

10 contaminate all areas."

Did I read that excerpt

12 correctly?

11

13

A. Yes, you did.

14 Q. And this is a document that

15 you didn't see as part of your

investigation; is that right? 16

17 A. No, I did not.

18 Q. And you don't know what

period of time this problem existed 19

20 or whether it existed during the

period when the boats in question 21

were being manufactured; is that 22

23 right?

24 A. I'm not sure it's during

131

1 A. Yes, I see that.

O. Again, you don't know if 2

that - if such problems had existed

in the period 1997 to 2004?

5 A. No. I have no idea.

O. And you didn't see this

document as part of your

8 investigation?

9 A. That's correct.

10 MR. BIZAR: Let's mark this

11

6

7

15

21

12 (Exhibit Jones 11 was

marked for identification.) 13

14 BY MR. BIZAR:

Q. Exhibit 11 is a two-page

16 document that is from Viking's files.

The first page is handwritten, but 17

the second page, which may be easier

19 on your eyes, is the typewritten

20 version.

A. (Witness reviews exhibit.)

Q. It's another message from 22

Juan Beltran to a variety of people 23

relating to the manufacturing

133

their manufacturing, but it may be

between their Post finishing, in the 2

3 finished area.

4

5

13

O. But there's not -

A. But I don't -- you know.

Q. I'm not asking you to 6

7 speculate. My question is simply you

don't know what period of time this 8

9 problem existed or whether it existed

10 during the period in time when the

11 boats in question were being

12 manufactured?

A. No, I do not.

14 Q. Okay. And you didn't

consider this document as part of 15

your investigation? 16

A. No. I did not. 17

18 (Exhibit Jones 12 was

19 marked for identification.)

20 BY MR. BIZAR:

21 Q. I had the court reporter

22 mark another two-page document.

23 Again, this is from Viking's files

24 and it's partly handwritten and then 35 (Pages 134 to 137)

134

the text is on the second — is on

the first page. This has been marked

3 as Exhibit 12.

6

7

13

4 Have you seen this document 5

before today?

A. No, sir.

Q. This document refers to a

8 heater. "The only heater that works

in the hull area is the north side

between the 6148 mold. The other two

do not work. Could you please look

into this matter." 12

Do you see that?

A. Yes, sir. 14

Q. Temperature conditions in 15

the manufacturing plant are

significant in the manufacturing of

fiberglass, would you agree with

19 that?

20 A. They can be.

21 Q. And they can, if not

22 appropriate, produce problems that

23 appear later on?

A. Usually they appear right

136

it was about 65 degrees.

2 "Now I'm skinning the hull

and it's about 55 degrees in the hull

area. We are going to have problems 4

later with things not curing right. 5 б I'm just following up. I talked to

7 your secretary already with this

8 e-mail."

9

Do you see that?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. This is a document -- well,

again, temperature issues are issues 12

that can affect gel coat performance? 13

14 A. Yes, they can.

Q. And this is a document that 15

you didn't consider in connection

17 with your investigation into

18 manufacturing practices at Viking?

19 A. That's also correct.

O. And you haven't seen it, in

20

21 fact, prior to today; is that right? 22

A. That is also correct.

23 Q. And you haven't seen, well,

24 any documents related to

135

away but yes.

Q. And this is a document that 2 you didn't see prior to today? You

3 said that a moment ago. 4

5 A. That's correct.

O. And you didn't consider it 6

as part of your investigation into 7

the manufacturing practices at 8

9 Viking?

11

10 A. That's also correct.

(Exhibit Jones 13 was

12 marked for identification.)

BY MR. BIZAR: 13

Q. Defendant's Exhibit 13 is a

15 three-page document, again, on the

subject of the heater dated December 16

17 9, 2002.

18 It states in the text part

to Dan Passarelli from Juan Beltran

and James Parker, "Could you send

someone to check the heater in the 21

22 hull area in Viglass.

23 "None of them are working.

24 We gelled the 61580 this morning and

137

manufacturing conditions at Post;

2 isn't that right?

3

4

5

8

A. That's correct.

Q. Do any of these documents

in any way affect your opinion about

the quality of the manufacturing

practices at Viking? 7

A. Well, no, it doesn't change

any at all. It sounds like they're 9

well educated in what can and cannot

affect the performance of the 11

12 materials.

And they're aware of the 13

14 situation and they're, you know,

attempting to remedy it as best that 15

16 they can

17 Water leaks and cold

temperature and high temperatures are 18

19 very common.

Q. And gel coat thickness is 20

common as well? 21

A. Oh, sure. They can range 22

23 all over the place.

Q. And so confronted with 24

www.JDReporting.com

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

138

- 1 these documents, you still think that
- 2 the manufacturing practices at the
- 3 Viking plant were totally fine and
- 4 are not in any way to be faulted in
- 5 connection with the gel coat cracking
- 6 issue; is that right?
- 7 A. I would say that the
- 8 construction processes and QA and QC
- 9 of what exists in the Viking plant
- 10 and what I believe to have existed
- 11 over the period of time that I've
- 12 been familiar with them is probably
- 13 an order of magnitude better than the
- 14 standard in the industry.
- 15 So I would say, yes, it has
- 16 not affected my opinion at all.
- 17 Q. And you have the same
- 18 opinion with regard to Post?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. And your basis for the
- 21 opinion with regard to Post is just
- 22 your knowledge of their general
- 23 reputation in the industry?
- 24 A. No. I've had

140

- even know if I kept them, to be
- 2 honest with you.
- 3 MR. BIZAR: Just for good
- 4 form sake, can you hand me the
- 5 Subpoena?

6

9

11

- (Exhibit Jones 14 was
- 7 marked for identification.)
- 8 BY MR. BIZAR:
 - Q. Exhibit 14 is a copy of a
- 10 Subpoena to you.
 - Have you seen this before?
- 12 A. I'm sorry. What's the date
- 13 on this
- 14 Q. August 28, 2007.
- 15 A. Yeah. I must have seen it,
- 16 yes.

22

- 17 Q And attached to the cover
- 18 page is a series of document requests
- 19 that begin under the page captioned
- 20 Document Requests?
- 21 A. Yes.
 - Q. And did you produce all the
- 23 documents that you had in your
 - 4 possession in response to these

139

- 1 communications with the people at
- 2 Post and I've interviewed the head of
- 3 the glass shop and the people who
- 4 have actually done the spraying.
- 5 And, you know, here's a
- 6 company that has people that have
- 7 been employed by that company for 17
- 8 years or 23 years and well educated
- 9 in their process.
- 10 And they seem to know what
- 11 the responsibilities are and what the
- 12 proper procedures are.
 - Q. The people that you
- 14 interviewed at Post, can you identify
- 15 them by name?
- 16 A. I don't recall their names,
- 17 no

13

- 18 Q. Did you take notes during
- 19 those interviews?
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 Q. Were the notes produced to
- 22 me?
- 23 A. I don't know if they were
- 24 or not. I don't you know, I don't

141

- 1 requests?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. Now, turning our attention
- 4 back to your report, if we can, you
- 5 have not identified any documents
- 6 from a company or any information
- 7 from a company called Performance
- 8 Cruising

- Is that right?
- 10 A. I don't recall them, no.
- 11 O. Are you familiar with a
- 12 company called Performance Cruising?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Have you seen the report of
- 15 the defendants' expert, Dr. Strong,
- 16 in this case?
- 17 A. Oh, yes. Yes.
- 18 Q. Did you read that report?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 Q. Did you see reference to
- 21 Performance Cruising in that report
- 22 or don't you recall?
- 23 A. Yes. I believe there was a
- 24 reference



37 (Pages 142 to 145)

142

Q. Are you familiar with

Performance Cruising from your work 2

in the marine industry?

A. No. sir.

5 Q. If I represented to you

that Performance Cruising was a 6

manufacturer of catamarans and

8 trimarans in Annapolis, Maryland,

9 would that be news to you?

10 A. It sure would

Q. And if I represented to you

12 that Performance Cruising used not

merely the same formulation of gel

coat as Post Marine but the same gel

15 coat from the same batches, the same

manufacturer's batches, would that

17 also be news to you?

18 A. Yes.

11

19 Q. And if I represented to you

20 that Performance Cruising had not had

experience, cracking experience, with

those batches of gel coat that Post

Marine had had, would that be news to

24 you? 144

Affidavit of Tony Smith in this case

2 that attests to all those facts,

3 right?

4

5

9

13

17

A. Not that I can recall.

O. And you haven't seen the

6 deposition testimony of Tony Smith or

7 the exhibits to that deposition

8 either?

A. That's also correct.

10 Q. And does that in any way

11 change your opinion that the gel coat

12 is materially defective?

A. No.

Q. Why not? 14

15 A. Just from what I've

16 witnessed in the boat, in Mr. -

O. Tortora?

18 A. — in Mr. Tortora's boat

19 and what has been related to me by

both Viking and Post as the wide

number of boats that are very similar

in cracking phenomena and the fact

that the cracks do not have any rhyme

24 or reason to them as far as being

143

1 A. Yes.

Q. And if I represented to you 2

that Performance Cruising, the boats

on which Performance Cruising had

5 used its - withdrawn.

If I represented to you

.7 that Performance Cruising had used

the CCP 953 Series gel coat that 8

comes from the same batches as Post

10 Marine's 953 Series gel coat on boats

11 that were used in extreme cold

12 temperature climates, would that be

13 news to you?

A. Sure. 14

15 Q. And if I represented to you

16 that using the same batches of gel

coat, the same formula of gel coat,

18 on boats used in cold weather climate

19 Performance Cruising had not had a

20 cracking experience like Post Marine,

21 that would be news to you as well; is

22 that right?

24

23 A. That's correct.

Q. And you've never seen the

coincident with stress lines or hard 1

spots or anything of that nature. 2 3 They're so global and so

random and it's almost bizarre, you 4

5 know, how global it is. I've never

seen that, except in the one 6

7 instance.

8 And the fact that this

9 Performance - you say that

Performance catamaran has been using 10

the same batch or did use the same

batch and their boats went to cold 12

climates, I know nothing about how 13

long they were there, whether - the 14

15 duration, you know, how many times,

16 what the cycle of temperature was.

I know nothing about it.

18 So I couldn't respond to that. I

19 wouldn't know.

17

20

Q. So you can't respond

21 because you don't have enough

22 information?

23 A. I don't have enough

information. And even if everything

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

146

- that you have told me, if it were all
- true, it still wouldn't change my
- 3 opinion. What I saw is what I saw
- 4 and -
- 5 Q. What you saw in the one
- 6 boat, the Tortora boat?
- A. Yeah. And what has been
- represented to me by people that I
- trust and have confidence in, that
- 10 the other boats are. I'll say in
- quotes, all the same. You know, no,
- it doesn't change my opinion at all. 12
- Q. So just to be clear, you 13
- 14 haven't considered any of the
- 15 information that's been available in
- 16 the record in this case with regard
- 17 to the experience of Performance
- 18 Cruising using 953 Series gel coat
- 19 made by CCP, correct?
- A. That is correct. 20
- 21 Q. And you haven't - and the
- fact that they used the same gel coat 22
- formula, same batches, in cold
- weather climates is immaterial to

148

- 1 A. I believe that it's related
- 2 to environmental exposure.
- 3 Q. So use conditions,
- 4 conditions in the field, the way the
- 5 boats are handled affects gel coat
- 6 cracking?
- 7 MR. WEISZ: Object to the
- 8 form.

9

16

- BY MR. BIZAR:
- 10 O. Is that right?
- MR BIZAR: I'm sorry. Is 11
- 12 your objection that it's compound? 13
 - MR. WEISZ: No. It's
- objecting that it assumes facts not 14
- 15 in evidence.
 - MR. BIZAR: Okay.
- 17 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
- 18 Could you -
- 19 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 20 Q. Sure.
- 21 A. - repeat it?
- 22 Q. Are use conditions, meaning
- 23 conditions in the field and the way
 - boats are handled, do those

147

- your opinion? 1
- A. Well, I would just have to 2
- look at the record on the Viking and
- Post boats. Not every boat they used
- 5 953 cracked.
- Q. Well, we'll get to that in 6
- a second. I'm just focused right now 7
- on the Performance Cruising.
 - A. It correlates. It
- 10 doesn't - you know, doesn't change
- my opinion at all. 11
- Q. So the fact that the 12
- Performance Cruising boats made from 13
- the same batches as Post Marine boats 14
- doesn't crack in your view is akin to
- the fact that or equivalent to the
- fact that some Post and some Viking
- 18 boats have not cracked; is that
- 19 right?

9

- 20 A Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. And why is it that in your
- 22 view if the gel coat is materially
- 23 defective, why is it that some Post
- and Viking boats have not cracked?

- conditions affect gel coat cracking? 1
 - A. Certainly.
- 2 Q. And do environmental 3
- 4 conditions, temperature, thermal
- 5 qualities, thermal conditions, do
- 6 those affect gel coat cracking?
 - A. Yes, sir, they do.
- 7 8 O. And when you say that the
- 9 experience of Performance Cruising
- 10 not having cracks with boats made
- 11 with the same batches as Post and the
- 12 experience of Post and Viking in not
- 13 having cracks in some of their boats
- in your view are equivalent, is that
- because they may have equivalent use 15
- conditions in the field or equivalent 16
- 17 environmental conditions?
- 18 A. Possibly. That could be a
- 19 reason, sure.
- 20 Q. Do you have any other
- 21 explanation for the fact that the
- 22 boats have not all cracked if the gel
- 23 coat is materially defective?
- 24 A I believe it's - I believe

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

it's exposure. 2 Q. And you haven't made any 2 industry." 3 systematic study of the ways in which 3 4 boats were exposed, boats in 5 question, boats made at Post and paragraph. 6 6 Viking with 953 Series gel coat were 7 7 exposed to the temperature or the A. That's correct. 8 environment or how they were used in 8 9 the field, right? 9

10 A. It's been my understanding 11 that the major portion of the boats

150

that were affected have been cold 12

13 climate boats.

Q. I understand that that's 15 your testimony, but my question is you haven't done a systematic study

on all the boats on which 953 Series 17

gel coat has been applied?

A. I apologize. No. I have 19 20 not made a systematic study of that.

21 Q. You haven't interviewed the owners; you haven't gone to the

marinas and looked at the boats; you 24 haven't looked at any records

152

referred to throughout the composites

That's on the second page of your report in the first full

That's CCP, right?

Q. And CCP is well regarded and a company that you respect.

You testified to that

11 earlier?

10

22

1

2

13

22

12 A. Yes, I did.

13 Q. And that's - their general reputation for fine manufacturing and

15 fine quality products is known in the

16 marine industry; is that right? 17 A That's their general

18 reputation, correct.

19 Q. And you're familiar with 20

other gel coat manufacturers, right?

21 A. Certainly.

Q. You're familiar with HK?

23 A. HK.

24 Q. And Interplastics?

151

relating to how those boats have been

maintained; is that right? 2

3 A. That is correct.

4 O. And, in fact, your

understanding that the boats were

exposed to cold weather climates

7 comes from Viking and Post personnel

telling you that; is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. And that's a fact that

you've taken at face value, right,

12 or -

9

13 A. Sure.

14 Q. - as an assumption in your

15 analysis?

16 A. Sure.

Q. Now, just to get this off 17

the table, in your report you say,

"The gel coat manufacturer of the

20 product used in the Viking and Post

vessels has always promoted their

products as the best products of this

type available and their expertise

and knowledge is well respected and

153

A. Yes.

Q. And have you done any

evaluation of their gel coats for

purposes of your report in this case? 5

A. No.

6 Q. Have you looked at any

7 documents that they - that we

obtained from HK or Ashland or any 8

9 other third party as part of your

10 analysis in this case?

11 A. I remember an Ashland

12 document. I remember an HK document.

MR. BIZAR: Let's look at

14 the HK documents first.

15 (Exhibit Jones 15 was

marked for identification.) 16

17 BY MR. BIZAR:

18 Q. I've had the court reporter

19 mark some documents that were

20 obtained from Ashland in response to

21 a Subpoena in this case.

And I believe that these

23 documents are among the documents

24 that you referenced in your report as 40 (Pages 154 to 157)

154

- having been reviewed by you.
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So you recall seeing these 3
- documents as part of your work in 4
- 5 this case?

11

- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. Do you know what these
- 8 documents show?
- 9 A. They show the results of
- 10 exposure testing.
 - Q. Carried out by HK?
- A. I believe so. 12
- Q. And what was the exposure 13
- testing testing of? Do you know? 14
- 15 A. Gel-coated panels.
- Q. Do you know anything about 16
- 17 the composition of those gel-coated
- 18 panels, how they were made?
- 19 A. No, I don't...
- 20 Q. Do these tests mean
- 21 anything to you?
- 22 A. Without studying them and
- drawing graphs and looking at them, 23
- the numbers are just the numbers.

156

- A. Yes. I believe they have
- 2 two different types that they use or
- 3 a number of different types that they
- 4

7

8

- 5 Q. And do you know what, if 6
 - anything, Ashland supplies to Post?
 - A. No, I don't recall.
 - Q. Is it your understanding
- 9 that Ashland has an interest in not
- 10 being held responsible – well, let
- 11 me do it this way. Withdrawn.
- Would it be fair to presume 12
- 13 that Ashland has an interest in not
- being held responsible for the gel 14
- coat cracking at issue with regard to
- the Viking and/or Post boats? 16
- 17 MR. WEISZ: Object to the
- 18 form.

1

4

- 19 THE WITNESS: I think it
- 20 would be fair to presume they don't
- 21 want to get any on them.
- 22 BY MR BIZAR:
- 23 Q. It's not a stretch of the
- 24 imagination -

155

- Q. And did you rely on these 1
- 2 test results in any way in reaching
- 3 your opinion?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. Okay. That's all I need to
- 6 know.
- 7 So this document, although
- 8 it's disclosed in your report, has
- nothing to do with your conclusions;
- 10 is that right?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 O. Let's look at the Ashland
- 13 documents next.
- Ashland is a company that 14
- 15 supplies materials to the plaintiffs;
- 16 is that right?
- 17 A. I believe so.
- 18 Q. Do you know what Ashland
- supplies to Viking for purposes of 19
- the boats at issue in this case? 20
- 21 A. I believe they are the sole
- supplier of the resin that's used. 23 Q. The back-up resin, the
- laminating resin?

- A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. - to assume that, right?
- 3 A. Yeah, yeah.
 - MR. BIZAR: Okay. Let's
- 5 mark this as 16.
- 6 (Exhibit Jones 16 was
- 7 marked for identification.)
- 8 BY MR BIZAR:
- 9 Q. The court reporter has
- 10 marked as Exhibit 16 to your
- 11 deposition, Mr. Jones, a collection
- 12 of documents that were obtained
- 13 pursuant to a Subpoena from Ashland.
- 14 And these documents, are
- 15
- they documents that you've seen
- 16 before?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And they were documents
- 19 that you actually saw in connection
- 20 with your work in this case; is that
- 21 right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And did you rely on these
- documents in any way in connection

41 (Pages 158 to 161)

158

with your work?

A. I'd really have to read

them again to know. 3

O. As you sit here today, do 4

you know whether you - do you recall 5

whether you relied on them in any 6

way?

2

7

A. I think I used it as 8

9 another data point in what I was

10 looking at and I didn't see anything

that was - struck me as being -

12 Q. Conclusive?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. There was nothing

conclusive in these documents; is 15

16 that right?

17 A. Right.

Q. Do you know - I'm sorry. 18

19 A. Yeah. Nothing that struck

me as, you know, nailing it right

down.

Q. You understand these 22

23 documents as reflecting the results

of various tests that were carried

160

O. And do you know whether the

2 white gel coat in question was CCP's

3 white gel coat?

4 A. Not without reading the 5

documents again.

6 O. Do you recall whether it 7

was?

9

8 A. No, I don't recall.

O. If you just would – and

10 just to be clear, you said a moment

ago that nothing stood out in these 11

documents to you. It was just 12

13 another data point.

Did you rely on them in any 14 15 way for your opinion in the case?

16 A. Just that it kind of

confirmed my opinion that it wasn't 17

the base laminate. There wasn't 18

something out of whack with the 19

20 resin. And that was the data point.

21 Q. I'll just direct your

22 attention to the page that has the

Bates number ASH 17, which has the

Jones Bates Number 720. The Jones

159

out by Ashland -1

2 A. That's right.

Q. - on materials? 3

A. That's right.

5 Q. And do you understand

whether these tests included - do 6

you know what materials were being 7

8 tested?

4

9 A. Well, it was pretty much

10 the base resin.

They were looking at 11

12 different resins that Viking and I

guess - I think this is just geared

14 toward the Viking Company, the

15 different resins that they were using

16 and whether or not they were

adequately cured and whether or not 17

18 they were an issue in the gel coat

cracking, whether they could be

pointed out as being an issue.

21 Q. Do you understand that they

22 looked at both core resins and the

23 white gel coat as well?

A. Yes.

24

161

one is the one at the very bottom.

Tell me when you're there. 2

3 A. I'm here.

4 Q. Look through that page and

5 focus on the summary, if you would.

6 A. Uh-huh.

Q. Do you see that underlining

of the first sentence? 8

A. Yes.

7

9 10 Q. Is that your handwriting?

A. I don't think so.

11 O. Okay. It says there, "DMA 12

results show undercure in the gel 13

coat material as seen by an increase 14

15 in Tg for the 2nd scan results."

Do you see that? 16

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. Tell me what that means in

19 English.

20

A. Well, what that means is

21 that the DMA test essentially

22 heats - adds heat to the laminate or

23 to the material that they're 24 measuring or analyzing and it

9

13

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

162

measures the glass transition

temperature, the Tg. 2

And they run it through again a second time to get a

percentage cure, and this is - they 5

actually measure the heat going in

and the heat coming out. And if

there's residual heat, then that 8

means that there's an undercure

10 situation.

3

4

O. What does that mean, an 11

undercure situation? 12

A. That means that there has 13 not been complete cross-linking

between the constituents of that

16 layer 17

Q. And what causes that?

18 A. Anything

19 O. Does that tell you anything

.20 about the quality of the gel coat?

21 A. Well, it could be the

22 quality of the gel coat. It could

23 be --

24 Q. The test? 164

district manager for Ashland and he's 2

writing to another Ashland person.

3 At the bottom of the page

4 he writes, "Jim, I'm not certain. I 5 would guess that these are caused by

uncured gel coat seeping into the 6

7 laminate but question, question?"

Do you see that?

A. Yeah. Usually uncured gel

10 coat seeping into the laminate,

that's more of a visual thing. You 11

can actually see that. 12

Q. If you look to the next

14 page in the document, 741, you can

see that they're referring to

pictures and reports from cut-outs

17 that Viking had asked for analysis

18 on. You can see that at the bottom

19 of the page.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. And then immediately above

22 that e-mail they refer to electron

23 scanning micrographs from Ashland

Analytical and they say, "I am not

163

1 A. It could be the tech. It

2 could be anything. You know, the

3 percentage of catalyst that went in

4 on that particular day, the guy

5 didn't hold his tongue to the left

6 when he pulled the trigger. It could

7 be any number of things.

Q. So the result means nothing 8

9 one way or the other?

10 A. It doesn't surprise me.

11 I've seen this before.

12 Q. It doesn't show that the

13 gel coat material is defective, does

14

15 A Somebody could look at that

16 and say, well, you know, let's look a

little further. You know, it's a

data point that says that, well,

yeah, we did find something, you

20 know, in a routine investigation.

21 And this is fairly routine.

22 Q. And how – let me just

23 direct your attention to the page

740, DEJ 740. Mr. Keenan is a

165

sure we learned anything as to the

2 root cause." Right? 3

A. Right.

4

5

9

Q. Do you see that?

And then above that they

6 talk about potentially running a

coefficient for linear thermal 7

8 expansion to look for a root cause

and then on the next page there's the

10 comment from Bob Keenan.

11 Are any of these analyses

12 in any way analyses that you relied

13 on or considered as part of your

14 opinion in this case?

A. Well, I've relied on them 15

that this is - I believe that these 16

17 tests were valid.

18 If you look at the acreage

that a boat builder produces, the 19

acreage of gel coat surface that a 20

21 builder produces in any given period

of time, to find a few spots here and

there would not surprise me at all. 2.3

It would not be uncommon.

43 (Pages 166 to 169)

166

Q. What do you mean by that, 1 to find a few spots? You mean a few 2 3 spots where the building was not up 4 to snuff? 5

A. Oh, you have a guy that is 6 spraying gel coat, let's just take that application for a moment. 7 8

Q. Fine.

9 A. And he's got areas - let's 10 say we're gel coating this table. Well, it's very easy to gel coat a nice flat plane. But then when you 13 gel coat in here -

14 Q. It's more complicated?

15 A. - it's much more

complicated. And you wind up with

17 thick areas and thin areas and it's

just an artifact of the construction 18

process. 19

20 Most of the stuff, whether

21 it's too thick or it's too thin, will

show up before the boat gets out the 23 door.

24 Q. Is that true when the gel 168

A. They may be in the 1 2 manufacturer's control, yes.

3 Q. And you don't view these as 4 in any way conclusive one way or the

5 other?

6 A. It's like hearing that

7 knock in your engine and going around

8 and trying to figure out what it is.

9 Yep, there's a knock and it's not

10 this, it's not this, it's not this.

11 So that leaves a few other 12 doors open. It's that type of thing.

13 It's not conclusive. It doesn't go

to the root cause. It just 14

15 eliminates a couple areas.

Q. Do any of these tests 16 17 eliminate the gel coat?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Did you - and, again, you

20 looked at this but you reached your

21 opinion independent of this

information, meaning you looked at

23 Exhibit 16?

24 A. I considered it.

167

coat is not cured properly as well? 1

A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Very 2

often that will be discovered in the

finishing department or after they

5 put a black stripe on it or something

of that nature. It sits out in 6

7 commissioning for a little while.

A lot of that will come up.

9 And while the boat's at the factory, 10

they can attend to those and those are considered fairly routine. 11

Not a big surprise there. 12

13 None of this is really a surprise.

Well, except for the global nature 14

15 but the - to have spots here and

16 there is - no, it's not a big

17 surprise.

8

18 Q. So you understand these

19 test results as reported by Ashland

20 in these e-mail exchanges which we've

looked at very briefly as referring

to issues where there may have been

23 undercuring or things within the

manufacturer's control?

Q. But your opinion is your

opinion? It's not based on this 2

3 testing?

1

4

5

7

20

A. No.

Q. Is that right?

A. That's correct. 6

MR. BIZAR: Let's take a

8 five-minute break

9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going

10 off the video record. The time is

11 11:49 a.m.

12 (A break was taken at this

13 time.)

14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are

back on the video record. The time 15

16 is 12:35 p.m. This is the start of

17 tape three.

18 BY MR. BIZAR:

19 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Jones.

A. Good afternoon.

21 Q. We were talking this

22 morning, in part, about the work that

23 you did on behalf of Atlantic Mutual

with regard to the Tortora yacht in

www.JDReporting.com

44 (Pages 170 to 173)

an earlier period prior to your
engagement in this case.
Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Just to be clear, you were
hired by Atlantic Mutual for that
matter; is that right?
A. That's correct.

170

9 Q. And Atlantic Mutual was the 10 insurer for whom?

11 A. Mr. Tortora.

12 Q. And how did Atlantic Mutual

13 find you; do you know?

14 A. I've worked with them

15 before

Q. And had you worked with
 them prior to that – to being hired

18 for that project? 19 A. Yes, sir.

19 A. Yes, sir.20 Q. And have you worked with

21 them since that project?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. They haven't expressed anydispleasure with the work that you've

172

1 couldn't tell you for sure, but I

2 believe I did.

3 Q. Okay. And that report4 would have been something that you

5 would have tried to be careful,

6 objective and impartial in as well;

7 is that right?

8

9

11

A Certainly

MR. BIZAR: Let me mark as

10 the next document this e-mail.

(Exhibit Jones 17 was

12 marked for identification.)

13 BY MR. BIZAR:

14 Q. I've had the court reporter

15 mark a one-page document as Exhibit

16 17. It appears to be a series of

17 e-mails between you and Mr. Lonni

18 Rutt and then Mr. Rutt passing that

19 e-mail on to various other people.

20 And the e-mails are dated

21 September 9 in terms of your e-mail

22 to Mr. Rutt and Mr. Rutt's e-mail

23 forwarding your message is September

24 10.

2

7

9

171

1 done?

2 A. No, no.

3 Q. And the work that you've

4 done for them you've always tried to

5 use your best judgment?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. And to be independent and

8 impartial?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. And to answer the questions

11 that you are asked to address in a

12 professional and comprehensive way;

13 is that right?

14 A. That's correct.

15 O And in connection with the

16 work that you did for Atlantic

17 Mutual, you did the investigation

18 that included the optical

19 examination, the sampling that we

20 discussed?

24

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. And you claim that you

A. I believe I did. I

23 wrote a report for them?

173

1 Do you see that?

A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. And in your e-mail — first

4 of all, is that your e-mail to Mr.

5 Rutt?

6 A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you write - and you

8 wrote it on or around September 9 -

A. Yes, sir.

 $Q_{\cdot \cdot} - 2004$? And it regards

11 the boat Javelin, which is the

12 Tortora yacht?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 O. And it reflects the work

15 that was done as part of your

16 investigation on behalf of Atlantic

17 Mutual; is that right?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. And in your e-mail message

20 to Mr. Rutt you write, "Lonni, I have

21 copies of the work performed by TRI

22 and will forward them along. As for

23 a written opinion, I was not asked to

4 produce one as the work was

45 (Pages 174 to 177)

1

174

l inconclusive as to a direct cause.

2 "As we discussed, it did

3 point out that manufacturing was not

4 the cause."

5

7

11

Do you see that?

6 A. Yes, I do.

Q. Does that refresh your

8 recollection as to whether or not you

prepared a written opinion to

10 Atlantic Mutual?

A. Yes, it sure does.

12 Q. And so you don't think, now

13 having read this exhibit, Exhibit 17,

14 that you, in fact, prepared a written

15 opinion to Atlantic Mutual?

16 A. It appears that I did not.

17 Q. And you, therefore, did not

18 prepare a written opinion that said

19 that the gel coat was materially

20 defective to Atlantic Mutual; is that

21 right?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. And TRI, which is

24 referenced in this e-mail, what is

176

A. The heat of exotherm is

2 when you put a known amount of heat

3 into a material and it gives off more

4 heat than you put in...

5 Exotherm is a reaction when

6 two chemicals are -- you either have

7 endothermic or exothermic reactions.

8 They either take heat or they cause

9 heat.

10 Exotherm is causing heat.

11 And when you put additional heat in,

12 it drives the cure to completion and

13 in the process it will give off heat.

14 Q. And these tests, are they

15 tests on the gel coat material?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And as you report in your

18 e-mail to Mr. Rutt, the testing that

19 was done by TRI was inconclusive as

20 to a direct cause?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22

1

5

9

15

22

Q. So the TRI testing, the DMA

23 testing and the Tg, I'm sorry, the

24 DMA testing and the heated exotherm

175

I TRI?

7

11

2 A. Texas Research Institute.

3 O. And that was an institute

4 that you had engaged to look at the

5 samples; is that right?

6 A. That's correct.

O. And they carried out a

8 number of tests?

9 A. Yeah. There was a couple

10 that they did.

Q. Do you recall what the

12 tests were?

13 A. I think it was DMA and -

14 yeah, I think it was just the DMA

15 test. And they ran it twice to get

16 the Tg and also again to get the

17 heated exotherm.

18 Q. And the Tg is glass

19 transition temperature?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. And the heated exotherm,

22 just tell it to me like I'm six years

23 old in the words of Denzell

24 Washington, what is that?

177

testing were inconclusive.

2 They did not demonstrate

3 that the gel coat was to blame for

the cracking; is that right?

A. It also – as I state in

6 the report, that it did not - you

7 know, the manufacturer was not the

8 cause either.

Q. It said – well, just so

10 I'm clear, it didn't say that the gel

11 coat was the cause, right?

12 A. Correct,

13 O. And it didn't say that the

14 manufacturer was the cause?

A. Correct.

O. Okay.

17 MR BIZAR: Let's mark

18 this.

19 (Exhibit Jones 18 was

marked for identification.)

21 BY MR BIZAR:

Q. I've had the court reporter

23 hand to you as Defendant's Exhibit 18

24 a multi-page document that consists

- of a fax transmittal, an e-mail, and
- 2 then a series of DSC thermogram
- 3 graphs. Take a moment and look that
- 4 over.
- 5 A. Okav.
- 6 Q. Do you recognize
- Defendant's Exhibit 18? 7
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9
- Q. Tell me what it is.A. This was the results of the 10
- 11 testing that TRI did.
- 1.2 Q. In connection with the
- 13 Tortora boat?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. This is the testing that
- you reported to Mr. Rutt was 16
- inconclusive? 17
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. That did not cast blame for 19
- the cracking on the manufacturer or
- on the gel coat manufacturer? 21
- 22 A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And TRI is 23
- independent in this process, right?

180

- what Mr. Wolf does at TRI Associates.
- A. Mr. Wolf does not work for
- 3 TRI.

.2

7

9

22

24

- O Oh, who does he work for? 4
- 5 A. I think it's B.F. Goodrich
- 6
 - Q. Okay. At the time of this
- 8 e-mail did he work for TRI?
 - A No.
- O. Why is he involved in 10
- sending this e-mail then? Do you 11
- 12 know?
- A. He's a friend. He used to 13
- work for me. 14
- 15 Q. I see.
- 16 A. And I value his opinion.
- 17 Q. So you asked him to look at
- the test results? 18
- 19 A. Uh-huh.
- 20 Q. As an independent person
- whose opinion you value? 21
 - A. Uh-huh.
- 23 O. And he had no financial
 - stake in the matter either?

179

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- Q They have no interest, no .2
- financial stake one way or the other;
- isn't that right?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- O. And the e-mail, which is 6
- 7 the second page of Defendant's
- Exhibit 18, is an e-mail to you at
- D.E. Jones & Associates dated May 1, 9
- 10 2004, 10:17 a.m.
- Do you see that? 11
- A. Yes. 12
- Q. Did you see that e-mail and 13
- the attachments? 14
- 15 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And did you receive it on 16
- or around that date? 17
- 18 A. That's - yeah, I would
- 19 assume so.
- 20 Q. And the person who wrote
- 21 the e-mail is Art.
- 2.2 Is that Art Wolf?
- 23 A. Yes, it is.
- 24 Q. And Mr. Wolf - tell me

181

- 1 A. None.
- 2 Q. Like you at the time, he
- 3 was working to give an objective,
- impartial assessment, correct?
- 5 A. That's correct.
- 6 Q. And when it says
- 7 Frptestguru@aol.com, was that Mr.
- 8 Wolf's e-mail address?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. So he's writing to you from
- his e-mail address and you received 11
- this e-mail, right? 12
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 Q. Read the text of the
- 15 e-mail.

- 16 A. I've read it.
- 17 O. Okay. He says, "I have
- 18 reviewed the FTIR and DSC data you
- 19 sent."
- 20 Is that the data that's
- 21 attached to this e-mail?
- 22 A. That's correct...
- 23 Q. He then says, "I would have
- the following comments. FTIR the



47 (Pages 182 to 185)

182

two infrared scans are essentially

the same so the two samples were

formulating" -- "formulated using the

same organic constituents.

"The peaks, which represent 5 6 structure and functional groups, are 7 the same."

Did I read that correctly?

A. That's right

10 Q. And what is the FTIR?

A. Four-year transform

infrared spectroscopy. 12

Q. So it's an infrared scan;

14 is that right?

8

9

13

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. And the two scans, is he

17 looking at one sample that's cracked

and one sample that's not cracked?

19 A. Yeah. The top one on page

20 4120, VK 004120, the last page, it

21 doesn't identify the top scan but my

22 recollection -- let's see, gel coat 23 1A. Yes, these were both from the

24 Tortora boat. 184

calorimeter.

2 Q. And he then writes, "There does not appear to be anything wrong

3 or different about this data. So 4

5 without further information. I would

6 conclude that the gel coat damage was 7

caused by some other source.

8 "Perhaps the vessel was

9 under a tarp or covered for several

10 years in storage, perhaps the vessel

was stored downwind of a spray booth 11

or paper mill, perhaps the damage was

13 caused by a poor buffing job (large

14 grit), perhaps the vessel was

acid-washed." 15

16 Do you see that?

17 A. Yes.

20

1

9

Q. And I read that correctly? 18

19 A. Yes, you did.

Q. Mr. Wolf then writes, "I

would look for chemical, biological,

mechanical or environmental agents

for the cause of this damage. The 23

pictures you sent look more like 24

183

Q. Was one affected and one

not affected or were they both

3 affected?

A. No. I believe - I don't 4

recall. I believe all the samples 5

that we took from the Tortora boat,

7 my recollection is they all were

8 affected.

Q Q. Okay. And he then writes

10 in his e-mail to you, Mr. Wolf

11 writes, "DSC - the graph marked 'gel

12 coat round sample' shows a little

13 reactivity left, represented by an

14 exotherm around 115 degrees to 120

15 degrees Celsius.

"This is normal for

17 thermoset polyester resins. None of

these resins cure completely at

19 ambient temperatures."

Do you see that? 20

21 A. Yes.

16

22

24

Q. And the DSC, tell me what

23 that refers to.

A. Differential scanning

gouges and not like typical gel coat 2

3 "After the damage was done, the gouges became more noticeable," 4

5 I'm sorry, "became noticeable when

they filled with dirt/buffing, 6

7 compound/wax."

8 Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

10 Q. And I read that correctly?

A. Yes, you did. 11

Q. And then he says, "This is 12

just hypothesis based on what I've 13

14 seen. Hope this helps, Art."

15 So Mr. Wolf is writing to

16 you and he says, in essence, that he

doesn't think the gel coat is to 17

18 blame; isn't that right?

MR WEISZ: Object to the

20 form

19

21 THE WITNESS: I don't know

22 if I could interpret that out of it.

23 It was inconclusive.

24 BY MR. BIZAR: 48 (Pages 186 to 189)

1 Q. Okay. So the best you'll 2 say is that it's inconclusive as to

3 the cause?

4 A. Yeah.5 Q. And that was consistent

6 with the information that you

transmitted to Mr. Rutt?

8 A. Yes.

Q. So your opinion on behalfof Atlantic Mutual was the source of

1 the gel coat cracking witnessed on

12 the Tortora yacht was inconclusive as

13 to cause?

14 A. Yes, sir.15 MR. WE

MR. WEISZ: Objection to

16 form.

17

24

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

18 BY MR. BIZAR:

19 Q. Did you ever see a report

20 by CCP regarding the gel coat

21 cracking in the Tortora yacht?

A. I don't recall. I don't

23 believe I did.

MR. BIZAR: Let me mark

188

1 Q. So you did not consider

2 Defendant's Exhibit 18 in connection

3 with your opinion in this case; is

4 that right?

7

13

5 A. I don't recall seeing this,

6 so I guess that would be correct.

Q. And the conclusions that

8 Mr. Malle summarizes in his

9 transmittal letter to Mr. Heller,

10 which is the last page of this

11 exhibit, essentially is the same?

12 I'm sorry?

A. I stand corrected.

14 Q. So you do think you saw it?

15 A. I did review this.

16 Q. Okay. And the conclusions

17 that Mr. Malle summarizes in the last

18 page of his letter - in the last

19 page of the exhibit, his letter to

20 Mr. Heller, is that "It's reasonable

21 to conclude that the cracking

witnessed in 55-945 was a result of

23 treatments or conditions outside of

24 the control of either CCP or Viking

187

1 this.

2 (Exhibit Jones 19 was

3 marked for identification)

4 BY MR. BIZAR:

5 O. Defendant's Exhibit 19 is a

5 multi-page document titled

7 "Determination of the Root Cause of

8 Cracking in Viking Boat #55-945,"

9 dated June 4, 2004.

10 And attached to it at the

11 end as the last page is a file copy

12 of a letter from Ed Malle to Bill

13 Heller at Viking dated June 8, 2004.

14 Have you seen this document

15 before today?

16

A. No.

17 Q. In the cover letter, which

18 I can - you can just turn your

19 attention - well, take as long as

20 want - take as long as you need to

21 take to look through the document,

22 then let me know when you're done.

23 A. (Witness reviews document.)

24 Okay.

189

1 Yacht Company."

Do you see that?

3 A. No.

2

14

4 Q. Last page.

5 A. (Indicating.)

6 Q. Do we not have the

7 document? I'm sorry. I thought when

8 I had described the document, you had

9 this page.

10 A. Mine goes up to CCP 08152.

11 O We're going to make a

12 correction I'm going by the DEJ

13 numbers, which are up to 197.

A. I have 196.

15 Q. We'll fix that right now.

16 MR BIZAR: Let's just go

17 off the record for a second.

18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going

19 off the video record. The time is

20 12:52 p.m.

21 (A break was taken at this

22 time.)

23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on

24 the video record. The time is

www.JDReporting.com

49 (Pages 190 to 193)

190 192 1 A. That's correct. 1:01 p.m. 2 Q. The testing was MR. BIZAR: When we marked 2 3 inconclusive as to the source of the Defendant's Exhibit 18 (sic), I 3 gel coat cracking. It could not cast thought we were marking a document that included Bates numbers from DEJ 5 blame on the gel coat and it could 191 through 197 but apparently we not cast blame on Viking's 6 6 7 manufacturing process; isn't that 7 only went up to 196 on the copy. 8 8 We've now made a copy of right? 9 the document that includes page 197 9 A. That's correct. 10 and I'd like to have that 10 Q. And you don't have any substituted, if I may, for Exhibit 11 basis for disagreeing with or, 12 18. So if rather, you didn't have any basis for 13 THE WITNESS: 19. 13 disagreeing with Mr. Malle's 14 MR BIZAR: 19 rather. So 14 conclusions at the time of your discussions with Atlantic Mutual in 15 if you could take Exhibit 19 off-line 15 and put in Exhibit 19 with the right 16 the fall of 2004; is that right? 17 pages, that would be terrific. 17 A. I don't believe I saw this 18 (Exhibit Jones 19 was 18 in 2004. 19 19 re-marked for identification.) Q. Okay. But you did see the TRI results at the time? 20 MR BIZAR: Let's start 20 21 again. 21 A. Yes, sir, I did. BY MR. BIZAR: Q. And you'd have no basis for 22 22 23 disagreeing with those results? 23 Q. Mr. Jones, I've handed you A. No, no. TRI, I was okay as Defendant's Exhibit 19 a document 24

191

that has Bates numbers DEJ 191 through 197. Take a moment, look this over, particularly the last 3 4 page. 5 A. (Witness reviews document.) Okay. Q. Mr. Malle in the 7 8 transmittal letter to Mr. Heller, the page that has Bates Number DEJ 197, has a paragraph summarizing the results of the various tests that CCP did as part of its investigation. 12 13 Is that right? 14 That's correct. 15 O. And those tests are also summarized in the investigation report and the conclusions which are set forth in that paragraph are summarized on pages 196 and 197; is 20 that right? 21 A. That's correct. 22 Q. And the conclusions are essentially the same as the

conclusions of TRI; isn't that right?

193

1 with those. 2 O. And you don't think that 3 you saw this report to Viking in 4 2004? 5 A. No. I wouldn't have seen 6 it until --7 Q. Until this litigation? 8 A. Yes, sir. 9 Q. Do you disagree with the 10 summary that Mr. Malle has provided and the content of this investigative 11 report by CCP? 12 13 A. Yes. I do agree with it as 14 far as the testing that was 15 performed. 16 Q. I'm sorry. You agree with 17 it? 18 A. Yes. As far as the testing 19 that was performed. 20 Q. So you agree that the test 21 results reported in this 22 investigation report are true and 23 accurate as reported in this report, 24 Defense Exhibit 19?

7

194

- 1 A. They are representative of
- 2 the tests that were performed.
- Q. And the results obtained as 3
- 4 a result of those tests?
 - A. Yes.

5

- 6 O. And the conclusions that
- 7 Mr. Malle drew or that CCP drew from
- 8 those test results, do you understand
- 9 those conclusions as being accurate?
- 10 A. Accurate to the tests that
- 11 were performed.
- 12 Q. Okay. And you didn't do
- 13 any testing on your own of the
- 14 Tortora yacht, correct?
- 15 A. No. Of the Tortora, no, I
- 16 did not.
- 17 Q. The work that you did in
- 18 this case - well, let me go back.
- 19 Do you know that the
- 20 Tortora boat was repaired by Viking?
- 21 A. Yes, I do.
- 22 Q. Were you consulted with
- 23 regard to those repairs?
- 24 A. They told me what they were

196

- that you did and the work that you
- did on behalf of Atlantic Mutual;
- 3 isn't that right? 4
 - A That's right.
 - MR. BIZAR: Mark this as
- 6 Defendant's Exhibit 20.
 - (Exhibit Jones 20 was
- 8 marked for identification.)
- 9 BY MR. BIZAR:
- 10 Q. I've had the court reporter
- mark a document as Defendant's 11
- 12 Exhibit 20.
- 13 That's a multi-page letter
- from a lawyer named Rich Mannella at
- Atofina dated April 23, 2004 to a 15
- 16 lawyer named Don Sweetman at Gennet,
- 17 Kallman
- 18 Have I accurately described
- 19 Exhibit 20?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And Atofina, I'll represent
- 2.2 to you, at the time of this letter
- was responsible for assisting CCP 23
 - with regard to legal disputes. Okay?

195

- going to do and what my opinion was. 1
- Q. And what did they tell you? 2
- 3 A. They told me they were
- going to strip it and re-gel coat it.
- 5 Q. Did they tell you what gel
- 6 coat they were going to use?
- 7 A. I don't recall.
- 8 Q. Did you counsel them with
- 9 regard to what gel coat they should
- 10 use?
- 11 A. I don't recall.
- 12 O. Do you know whether CCP or
- its agents and representatives 13
- expressed a view as to the repair
- methods that were going to be 15
- 16 employed in repairing the Tortora
- 17 yacht?
- 18 A. No, I wouldn't know that.
- 19 Q. Did you ever inspect the
- 20 Tortora yacht after it was repaired?
- 21 A. Not to my recollection, no.
- 22 Q. In fact, the only time that
- 23 you recall seeing the Tortora yacht
- was in connection with the sampling

- A. Okay. 1
- 2 Q. Do you know Mr. Sweetman?
- 3 A Not personally, but I
- believe that I worked with him.
- 5 Q. And he was - you worked
- with him in connection with your work 6
- 7 on behalf of Atlantic Mutual; is that
- 8 right?
- 9 A. That's right.
- 10 Q. And he was, in fact, the
- 11 person who gave you permission to
- 12 collaborate with Viking?
- A. I believe that's true. 13
- 14 Q. Okay. And Mr. Mannella
- 15 writes to Mr. Sweetman and on the
- 16 last page of the letter, in the
- second-to-last paragraph, this is the 17
- 18 page that has the Bates number VK
- 19 1624, Mr. Mannella writes, "In
- 20 addition, CCP believes the cracking 21
- exhibited by this five year-old 22 vessel extends into the laminate
- 23 layers.
- 24 "As such, CCP does not



51 (Pages 198 to 201)

2

5

9

11

198

believe the repairs (stripping the

hull and respraying the gel coat

3 layer) is appropriate.

"Therefore, CCP does not," 4 not is underlined, "recommend the use 5 of any CCP gel coat product for the 6 7

repairs being undertaken."

8 Do you see that? 9

A. Yeah, I sure do.

Q. And CCP - you understand 10

that CCP is telling them not to use 11

their gel coat to repair the boat? 12

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Do you know whether Viking 14

used CCP's gel coat to repair the 15

Tortora boat? 16

13

17

2

7

17

A. No. I wouldn't know, but I

know why they recommend that. 18

Q. Tell me why. 19

20 A. Well, because they do not

21 like to use their materials - CCP

22 does not like to have their material

23 used for post finishing applications.

24 The gel coat is formulated 200

Tortora yacht, right?

A. I understand that that's

3 their opinion.

Q. Right? 4

A. Yeah.

6 Q. Okay. Do you know whether

7 CCP's 953 Series gel coat was used in

8 the repair of the Tortora boat?

A. No.

10 Q. You said you don't know?

A. No, I don't know.

Q. If it was used, would you 12

view that as being the responsibility 13

of the manufacturer, in other words, 14

the manufacturer's choice? 15

16 A. Meaning the builder's

17 choice?

18 Q. Yes. The builder's choice.

19 A. Oh, certainly, it would be

20 the builder's choice.

21 Q. Okay. Now, I asked you

22 earlier today about Dr. Strong's

23 report. You said that you had

24 reviewed it.

1

2

7

18

199

to be an in-mold coating.

And what that means is that

it's supposed to go onto a mold 3

surface and then a laminate placed 4

behind it to - essentially the 5

additional heat of the laminate helps 6

drive the cure through. And that's

8 the whole reason.

9 They don't like it post

applied, although I have employed CCP

in the refinishing of the Typhoon

Lagoon slides at Disney World in

13 Orlando and were very successful.

14 In fact, it was far

superior than the original in-mold 15

coating So... 16

Q. I'll tell them that you

appreciated the work. But my

question is really -19

A. I've already told them. 20

21 Q. My question is really you

understand this direction as being

CCP's products in the repair of the

clear and unequivocal not to use

201

A. I read it last night.

Q. Had you not read it prior

3 to last night?

4 A. No. Last night was the

5 first time I saw it.

Q. And you haven't read it in 6

connection with the opinion that you

issued in this report - in this 8

9 case; is that right?

10 A. That's correct.

Q. And your opinion was not in 11

12 response to that report?

A. No. Last night was the

13 14 first time I had seen it.

Q. And so you are not going to 15

16 be addressing his report in your

17 testimony at trial; is that correct?

A. No. I wouldn't imagine I

19

20 Q. You have provided to us as

part of your compliance with our 21

22 subpoena a collection of invoices for

23 the time that you spent on this

24 matter?

www.JDReporting.com

52 (Pages 202 to 205)

202 204 A. Okav. prepared for you by Mr. Weisz; is 1 2 Q. Did you know that? that right? A. Correct. 3 A. I'm sure I did. 3 MR. BIZAR: And I'd like to 4 O. And what material was in 4 5 just mark these as the next exhibit, 5 that binder? 6 which is 21. 6 A. Reams and reams of 7 (Exhibit Jones 21 was 7 information, some of which is listed 8 marked for identification.) 8 at the back of my report in the 9 BY MR BIZAR: 9 reference list. 10 Q. The invoices that I have 10 Q. And it's a single binder, to the best of your recollection? 11 from the production are numbered DEJ 11 A. Oh, I would be surprised if 1.2 pages 2, 3, 4 and 5. 1.2 13 Do you see that? 13 it was just one. 14 A. Okay. 14 Q. It says only binder. It 15 Q. Are these an accurate 15 doesn't say binders. collection of your bills in this A. Correct. 16 16 Q. Do you recall one way or 17 matter to date? 17 A. To the best of my 18 the other? 18 19 knowledge, yes. 19 A. I believe there were more 20 20 Q. And the first invoice, than one. which is the last page - we're going 21 Q. Okay. And this information in reverse chronological order - is was compiled or selected for you by dated as of October 13, 2006. 23 Mr. Weisz? 23 24 A. Yes, sir. 24 Do you see that? 203 205 Q. What criteria did he A. Yes. 1 1 2 .2 Q. And that reflects all of employ? 3 your work on this engagement up until A. I have no idea. that time; is that right? O. Did you tell Mr. Weisz what 5 A. We're looking at -5 to provide you? 6 Q. Page five. 6 A. No. no. A. Page five. As of - from O. So he decided -- he 7 7 8 September to October 13, yes. 8 selected documents to provide to you; 9 Q. And it shows basically 18 9 is that right? 10 10 hours or so of work? A. Yes, I would assume so. O. And you understand that the 11 A. Yes, sir. 11 Q. And some of that time documents that have been provided to 1.2 you in this case, which are listed in includes time that you spent reading 13 Viking DDP binder? 14 your report in the reference list of 14 materials, are not the entirety of 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. What does DDP refer to? 16 the documents that have been produced in this lawsuit; is that right? 17 A. I think that's a typo and 17 it should say CCP. 18 A. Oh, I understand that. 18 19 Q. Okay. And you didn't tell 19 Q. Okay.

20

21

22

23

you?

A. No, sir.

Mr. Weisz what information to give

Q. Okay. If you look at the

next document, which is the

be, so that's my guess.

So CCP.

20 21

22

23

24

A. I don't know what DDP would

Q. German Democratic Republic.

And that binder was

~	n	~
-	.,	n

- document the invoice dated
- December 4, 2006. That's page four.
- 3 A. Yeah.
- Q. You see there --4
- A. DDP. 5
- Q. reading "Viking DDP from 6
- Mr. Weisz." 7
- 8 A. Yeah.
 - Q. And, again, that is the
- same binder or same information; is
- that right?

- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. So you're continuing to 13
- read that information, right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- O. And then there's a 16
- reference to an e-mail to R. Rushing 17
- regarding test procedures?
- A. Yes. 19
 - Q. Who is Mr. Rushing?
- 21 A. He was the senior chemist
- 22 at TRI.

20

- 23 Q. So was he involved in or
- supervising the test results that had

208

- office? 1
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And what did you discuss
- 4

5

- A. We discussed the documents
- and the litigation and, you know, 6
- where my forte was and, you know, 7
- 8 just help him get our arms around the
- 9 situation.
- 10 Q. Did he discuss with you
- what he was looking for in the case? 11 12 A. Yeah, I guess so. Yes, I'm
- 13 sure we did.
- 14 Q. Okay. And what did you
- 15 say?

20

- 16 A. Well, I told him what I was
- 17 able to do.
- 18 Q. What your expertise or
- qualifications were? 19
 - A. Yeah, yeah.
- 21 O. These 14 hours that's
- 22 reflected here as a time entry for
- September 28, 2006, a substantial 23
- portion of that includes the travel

207

- been done on behalf of Atlantic
- Mutual back in 2004?
- A. Yes, sir. 3
- Q. And did Mr. Rushing respond 4
- to your e-mail or speak with you?
- A. Yeah. We must have had a 6
- 7 conversation.
- 8 Q. Do you recall what was
- 9 said?
- 10 A. No, I don't recall exactly.
- Q. Okay. 11
- 12 A. I'm not sure what
- 13 procedures we were talking about at
- 14 that time
- Q. Do me a favor and turn back 15
- 16 to the prior page, which is page 5.
- It says, "Travel and on site, Miami,
- Florida, airfare, return travel."
- 19 Do you see that?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. What was that trip about?
- A. That was going to spend a
- little time with Mr. Weisz. 23
 - Q. Did you meet him in his

209

- to and from Miami; is that right?
 - A. That would have been four
- 3 hours.

5

- 4 Q. Did you drive?
 - A. No.
- Q. You took a plane? 6
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. And the balance of it was 8
- meeting with Mr. Weisz or did you 9
- 10 spend some time waiting for the
- 11 plane?
- 12 A. Well, it's a one-hour plane
- 13 trip and there's travel to the
- airport and waiting time and then you 14
- get on the plane and you travel 15
- 16 there. And we spent the major
- 17 portion of the day together.
- Q. Did you spend ten hours 18
- with Mr. Weisz? 19
- 20 A. Probably pretty close to
- 21 it.
- Q. Did you look at documents 22
- 23 while you were with him?
- A. Yes, sir.



- O. And those documents are
- 2 documents that would have been
- 3 identified to me?
 - A Yes, sir.

4

- 5 O. They're included among the
- 6 documents listed in your report?
- 7 A. The documents that I've
- received are probably close to two
- 9 banker's box full
- 10 Q. Okay.
- A. And what I listed here was 11
- the ones that I used in direct
- 13 reference to what I was -
- Q. Okay. 14
- 15 A. The rest of them, I looked
- 16 at them.
- Q. Didn't feel the need to? 17
- 18 A. Most of them I read. Some
- 19 of them were gobbledygook or gook and
- 20 I just I read them but....
- 21 Q. The second page of Defense
- Exhibit 21, the page numbered page 22
- 23
- 24 A. Okay.

212

- hours maybe, eight hours.
- 2 Q. If Dr. Caruthers billed for
- half a day for that meeting, would 3
- 4 that refresh your recollection that
- 5 it was a half a day?
 - A. That would be about right.
- 7 four to six hours, something like
- 8

6

9

15

- Q. But you would defer to Dr.
- Caruthers if his bill was specific on 10
- the length of the meeting? 11
- A. He was -- I think this was 12
- 13 a place that he was staying at on
- vacation or something -14
 - Q. On vacation, correct.
- 16 A. - like that, so yeah.
- 17 Q. Okay. Now, while we're on
- the subject of Dr. Caruthers, have 18
- 19 you had a chance to read his report?
- 20 A. No, sir.
- Q. Have you ever seen his 21
- 22 report?
- 23 A. No. sir.
- 24 Q. Did you see his report in

211

- Q. refers to your travel to 1
- and from a meeting in Vero Beach? 2
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 O. And that was a meeting with
- Dr. Caruthers? 5
- A. That's correct. 6
- 7 Q. And Viking personnel?
- A. Yes sir. 8
- Q. There were no Post 9
- 10 personnel present at that meeting; is
- that right? 11
- 1.2 A. No. That's correct. There
- wasn't anybody from Post there. 13
- 14 Q. And you've billed an entire
- 15 day, 12-and-a-half-hour day, for that
- 16 trip, right?
 - A. That's right. I drove over
- 18 in the morning and drove back that
- 19 evening.

17

- 20 Q. And do you recall how long
- 21 the actual meeting with Dr. Caruthers
- 22 lasted?
- 23 A. No, I don't. But it was a
- real good portion of the day, six

213

draft form? 1

- A. No, sir.
- 3 Q Is your report in any way
- or your opinion in this case in any
- 5 way contingent upon any of his
- 6 findings?
 - A. No.
- 7 8 O. Is it in any way based on
- 9 any of his findings?
- 10 A. Well, I've never seen his
- 11 report, so no.
- Q. And he also issued a 12
- 13 supplemental report. I assume you
- 14 haven't seen that?
- 15 A. I haven't seen any of his
- 16 work.
- 17 Q. So your opinion and your
- 18 report is not in any way based on his
- 19 supplemental report either?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. There are also opinions
- 22 that were issued by four other
- 23 individuals, Peter Maryott, Philip
- 24 Barton, Earl Hall, and Philip

55 (Pages 214 to 217)

1

2

4

5

9

20

1 2

3

9

11

19

214

Robeson. 1

4

8

Did you see any of their 2

3 reports in this case?

A. No, not that I recall.

5 O. And your opinion then is

not based on any of their opinions or 6

their reports either? 7

A. No. sir.

9 Q. And you're not offering any

10 opinion or you don't intend to offer

any opinion at trial regarding the

cost of repairs that Post or Viking

13 may have had to make in this case?

14 A. No. I would have - having

done a lot of repair procedures for 15

broken boats, I would have a pretty

good handle on it, but, you know, on

what it would take to do the job.

19 But, no, I haven't been tasked to do

20 that.

Q. And you haven't done that 21

22 in your report?

23 A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. The final page of 24

216

A. I called him, ves.

O. And you conferenced-in Dr.

3 Caruthers?

A. No. I did not.

O. But there's a reference to

6 a teleconference with Dr. Caruthers 7

and Mr. Wolf.

8 Are those separate calls?

A. Separate calls.

Q. I see. 10

11 A. It just happened to be on

12 the same day.

13 Q. So Mr. Wolf has never

spoken with Dr. Caruthers, as far as 14

15 you know, in connection with Dr.

16 Caruthers' work in this matter?

17 A. I wouldn't know.

18 Q. Okay. But you were never

19 involved in any such conversation?

A. No. That's correct.

Q. And in terms of the review 21

22 and report writing, that's referenced

as having occurred on August the 18th

and 19th, 2007.

215

the bill, I'm sorry, of Defendant's

Exhibit 21, which is actually the

first page, page two, refers to a

variety of teleconferences that you

had with Mr. Weisz and Dr. Caruthers. 5

Do you see that?

A. Yes, sir.

6

7

8

9

15

O. Tell me what you discussed

with Dr. Caruthers during those

telephone conferences. 10

A. I think Dr. Caruthers was 11

getting ready to, I don't know, maybe

formulate some questions or get his 13

mind around what - the situation. 14

And he - I think his words

were he wanted to get the advice of

somebody that had a little gray hair 17

18 on the shop floor.

19 And Art certainly has that

kind of gray hair, that kind of

21 experience. And we just went back

22 and forth a couple of times.

23 Q. And Mr. Wolf was involved

24 in these discussions? 217

Is that correct?

A. That's what it says, yes.

Q. When did you reach the

opinions expressed in your report? 4

5 When in relation to the date on which

6 you wrote the report did you reach

7 the opinions you expressed?

8 A. Probably well before that.

O. And that was based on the

work that's reflected in these bills? 10

A. Yes, sir.

O. Is there any work -- are 12

13 there any other bills that have not

14 been provided to me that are

15 outstanding?

A. No, there are not. 16

17 Q. Do you expect to submit any

18 additional bills?

A. Just for today.

Q. Do you have any ongoing

20 21 projects that are related to the

22 opinion that you would offer in this

23 case?

24 A. No. I have no ongoing 56 (Pages 218 to 221)

·····	70 (1490) 210 00 221,				
	218		220		
1	projects at the moment.	1	having heard about gel coat problems,		
2	MR. BIZAR: Let's take a	2	read about them, seen gel coat		
3	five-minute break. I may be done.	3	problems over the course of time,		
4	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going	4	would you say that the majority of		
5	off the video record. The time is	5	gel coat cracking problems result		
6	1:23 p.m.	6	from either application or		
7	(A break was taken at this	7	misapplication of the gel coat or		
8	time.)	8	handling issues in the manufacturing		
9	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on	9	process?		
10	the video record. The time is	10	A. Yes.		
11		11	MR. BIZAR: I have nothing		
	1:24 p.m. BY MR. BIZAR:	12	further at this time.		
12		13	MR. WEISZ: We'll read.		
13	Q. In your written report, Mr.	1			
14	Jones, you refer on the first page to	14	MR. BIZAR: Thank you very		
15	the phenomenon of gel coat cracking,	15	much for your time, David.		
16	and you have two paragraphs about gel	16	THE WITNESS: That's quite		
17	coat cracking there.	17	all right. Thank you.		
18	Do you see that? It's the	18	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is		
19	third and fourth paragraphs that I'm	19	the end of tape three and concludes		
20	referring to.	.20	the videotaped deposition of David		
21	A. Yes.	.21	Evan Jones on January 30, 2008 at		
22	Q. And you list a number of	22	1:26 p.m.		
23	different causes of gel coat	23	(Witness excused.)		
24	cracking, "laminate problems, too	24	(Concluded at 1:26 p.m.)		
	219		221		
1	tight of a fit, not enough	1 2	WITNESS CERTIFICATION		
2	reinforcement, voids, delamination,	3	I hereby certify that I		
3	de-molding," and it goes on	4	have read the foregoing transcript of		
4	Do you see that?	5	my deposition testimony, and that my		
5	A. Yes, sir.	6	answers to the questions propounded,		
6	Q. All of those problems that	7	with the attached corrections or		
7	you've identified in these two	8	changes, if any, are true and		
8	paragraphs are problems that relate	9	correct.		
9	to the manufacturing process by the	10			
10	boat builder; is that right?	11			
11	A. Correct. That is correct.	12	DATE DATE DATE		
1.2	Q. And they relate to the		DATE DAVID E. JONES, III		
13	application of the gel coat during	13			
14		14			
	that process or other things that				
15	occur during that process; is that	15			
15 16	occur during that process; is that right?	15 16			
15 16 17	occur during that process; is that right? A. Well, it's also the	15	PRINTED NAME		
15 16 17 18	occur during that process; is that right? A. Well, it's also the handling of the boat after, after the	15 16 17	PRINTED NAME		
15 16 17 18 19	occur during that process; is that right? A. Well, it's also the handling of the boat after, after the fact, the structure of the boat,	15 16 17 18	PRINTED NAME		
15 16 17 18 19 20	occur during that process; is that right? A. Well, it's also the handling of the boat after, after the fact, the structure of the boat, whether it's adequately structured.	15 16 17 18 19	PRINTED NAME		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	occur during that process; is that right? A. Well, it's also the handling of the boat after, after the fact, the structure of the boat, whether it's adequately structured. Yes. It's basically around the	15 16 17 18	PRINTED NAME		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	occur during that process; is that right? A. Well, it's also the handling of the boat after, after the fact, the structure of the boat, whether it's adequately structured. Yes. It's basically around the manufacturer.	15 16 17 18 19 20	PRINTED NAME		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	occur during that process; is that right? A. Well, it's also the handling of the boat after, after the fact, the structure of the boat, whether it's adequately structured. Yes. It's basically around the	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PRINTED NAME		